



**HAL**  
open science

## Doubles, doubles, they cause trouble

Sharon-Marie Hagege

► **To cite this version:**

| Sharon-Marie Hagege. Doubles, doubles, they cause trouble. Literature. 2011. dumas-00681295

**HAL Id: dumas-00681295**

**<https://dumas.ccsd.cnrs.fr/dumas-00681295>**


Submitted on 2 Apr 2012

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

**USTV La Garde  
Faculté des Lettres et sciences humaines  
Master Recherche  
Année 2010/2011**

**Présenté par Sharon HAGEGE  
Sous la direction de M. Patrick MENNETEAU.**



**«Doubles, doubles, they cause trouble»**



## **CONTENTS:**

### ***INTRODUCTION***

#### **I. THE THEME OF THE DOUBLE APPLIED TO ORLICK**

- 1. Orlick seen as the perfect double through the image of the Devil.***
- 2. Orlick and the concept of the mirror.***
- 3. The rivalry between Pip and Orlick as the cement of their relation.***

#### **II. WHAT SCIENTISTS HAVE TO SAY ABOUT IT**

- 1. Dickens and Darwin.***
- 2. A psychoanalytical interpretation of Orlick's presence, Unheimlich.***
- 3. The shadow of Pip.***

#### **III. PIP/ORLICK FROM A LITERARY POINT OF VIEW**

- 1. Why does Pip reject the notion of the double?***
- 2. Why does Orlick force it on the hero?***
- 3. The trinity Pip/Pirrip/Orlick.***

#### **IV. THE IMPORTANCE OF MYTHS IN DICKENS'S NOVEL**

- 1. Dickens's inspirational work to create the pair Pip/Orlick.***
- 2. Orlick seen as a mythic figure, the importance of Hephaestus in Great Expectations.***

### ***CONCLUSION***



## **«Doubles, doubles, they cause trouble»**

### **Introduction:**

It is a generally acknowledged fact that the theme of the double is one which has been greatly used in literature for it is quite rich in its functions as well as in the problems which follow from the introduction of this entity. The occurrence of the figure is due to its ability to give depth to two different characters, revealing their similarities and yet their opposite characteristics and creating a symbolic bond that is not to be put aside by the reader. The double or “Doppelgänger”<sup>1</sup> as it is often called puts forward one major problem concerning its definition. Indeed the notion in itself being quite vague, one does not know if one should focus on what the figure represents or on what issues it raises or even on what kind of figure this double has chosen to assume. A definition seems impossible also because of the consecutive shifts in social concerns - as a matter of fact the double was first a mythical figure then was seen in a more psychological way and of course it was a key topic for literary critics. Thus when the time comes, we will see those various identities and aspects taken by the double and we will try and find out what they represent for “the original” as one might say and only then will the difficulty of grasping a clear definition of the subject show itself.

But what makes this topic so interesting is that it highlights several key concepts such as one’s identity in the eyes of others - also that of self-improvement or resignation to move forward, thus implying that one shall remain in the same position for the rest of one’s life. The theme of the double implies on the one hand the question of “what makes me who I am?” and also “what makes the others so different than myself?”. What follows from those two existential interrogations is obviously a crisis of identity, a kind of reaction for or against the characteristics which you are made of. Indeed, two different attitudes are possible when you become aware of who you really are, that is to say whether you start to loathe yourself or you decide to put forward those differences and claim your rights to be considered as a human being no matter what. This double tension is also illustrated in the actual reaction of the

---

<sup>1</sup> This term is a German word which is the usual literary term for the common phenomenon that is the double and which literally means « double-goer ». It was brought into the language, and simultaneously into the literary tradition – as a term only- by the novelist Jean-Paul Richter, who in 1776 defined the word in a one sentence footnote : “So heissen Leute, die sich selbst sehen” (So people who see themselves are called). Milica Zivkovic, *The Double as The Unseen Of Culture* by Milica Zivkovic, Facta Universitatis, 2000, p122.

character who has just found his double. Indeed, there will always be between the two protagonists a strong attraction for the other and yet a feeling of repulsion when face to face with him, proving once again an ambivalence that will make the term “indecision” a key-word in this kind of relation.

According to most major literary critics, *Great Expectations* is one of Dickens’s most famous works mainly because the author knew how to explore man’s deepest emotions and put them into a fiction that will help the characters involved deal with them so that hopefully they can embrace a new fate, a meaningful one. What also makes *Great Expectations* such a wonderful work is that it deals with so many pairs that reflect those opposite feelings and uncomfortable positions. However, since many critics have already worked on those pairs, what was left to say about this topic? Well, some doubles have not yet been considered as they should have been for they refer to so much more than what was said about them. That is why I chose to focus my work on the figure of Orlick and what he represents in reference to Pip. Indeed, the novel having already been established as a Bildungsroman<sup>2</sup> - where the reader can follow the main character from childhood to adulthood throughout a series of adventures – the first episodes of *Great Expectations* take place during Pip’s childhood, respectively in the marshes, at the forge, at home with Mrs Gargery and finally at Miss Havisham’s. Those places and particular times in Pip’s life are crucial to his evolution and it is then that we are introduced to Orlick.

Since they both start as blacksmiths (rather as an apprentice when speaking about Pip) they have approximately the same origins and will interestingly follow the same path. Indeed in the marshes, Orlick will be present as constantly as “a shadow image of the tender-minded and yet monstrously ambitious young hero”<sup>3</sup> but he will also more or less be by Pip’s side during the second stage of his expectations and finally on the third one with chapter LIII showing their final encounter and the villain’s revelations to the hero. This final scene (at least for our pair) proves very important for it points out every single aspects of Orlick in the light of Pip’s development, his functions in the process of growing-up, the justification of his acts and especially the murder of Mrs Gargery, the reasons why he won’t let go of the boy and a near-death experience supposed to put an end to the duet’s relation. However we will ponder on why this doesn’t end as it was supposed to since obviously we do not get a clear ending.

---

<sup>2</sup> A Bildungsroman is, most generally, the story of a single individual's growth and development within the context of a defined social order. The growth process, at its roots a quest story, has been described as both "an apprenticeship to life" and a "search for meaningful existence within society." Suzanne Hader (English 168, 1996) *The Bildungsroman Genre: Great Expectations, Aurora Leigh and Waterland*.

<sup>3</sup> Julian Moynahan, *The Hero's Guilt: The case Of Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p659.

So when Dickens put these two protagonists together he knew exactly what kind of atmosphere he was going to set and above all what kind of affect it would have on our young hero. Constantly playing with the thin line separating right from wrong, good from evil, innocence from violence, Dickens confuses the reader letting him doubt his perspectives and find reasons to blame poor Pip and feel sorry for Orlick. In this way he re-establishes the whole function of the book, in other words, what Philip Pirrip desperately tried to do (to tell the story in such a way that it would make the reader feel sympathetic towards him), Dickens reverses it and makes us see who the real Pip is. That is the main function of “the other”: it allows us to see ourselves by way of comparison with him. All we have to do afterwards is accept what we are seeing and that, unfortunately, will not be Pip’s case since he will constantly reject the idea of Orlick being his double.

Now that we have made a sort of overview of our pair, one can wonder to what extent the couple Pip/Orlick is ready to accept the other as his double, knowing that before accepting it you need to be aware of it. What is important with this problematic is that we try to demonstrate how Dickens has articulated the tension attraction/rejection with his two protagonists and how it has affected their whole personalities. The main idea is to understand throughout our work the reasons that make Orlick enforce the notion on Pip and the personal motives that render Pip unable to accept the fact that Orlick might be his second-self. Compared to last year the length of this mémoire will allow us to go into the particulars and we will thus try and emphasize the most important conclusions while developing them further for the completion of our work. Indeed, there are so many things that are to be said about those two characters, whether it be separately or put together, and the dynamic by which they operate is so peculiar when associated with that of the other that one could not just get past it.

Focusing on this specific question concerning the level of acceptance of the notion of the double, one might also have to answer several others, not as crucial but still necessary to understand our full investigation. Indeed the questions one would be prone to ask would be “How does that notion make *Great Expectations* a novel of its time?” “How far ahead of his time was Dickens in terms of general behaviour and relationship between self and society?” and finally “What kind of parallel can one draw with other works on the double?”. Those interrogations though not fundamental are all tightly linked to the main thread we will work on because Dickens has used this theme in such a way that it can be given many interpretations depending on whether we choose



a scientific point of view, a literary one or one inspired by mythical philosophies.

The topic in itself being very rich - even though the pair on which I based my work could have seemed quite restrictive – and the field of research being rather wide, it was tough sometimes to choose the right source or the right document. However when one learns to stop and once everything is put together, the conclusions that can be drawn from all this are so interesting that it stimulated me into doing a thorough job. Right now this work is not a revolutionary one even though it highlights key-points that I think were not that obvious to the casual reader. In my opinion it was necessary to say all that because as aforementioned Orlick needed to be shown in another light and be considered for more than he appears to be. In the same way the truth about Pip's personality needed to be restored as we will see that Pirrip was playing all along on a single idea, that of the young boy's innocence and naivety leading him to be fooled over and over again throughout the whole book. When having finished to read this work one should probably read the novel again and put everything into perspective so as to be as clear-sighted as possible when drawing one's own conclusions about the whole narrative.

Not willing to linger too much on the general problematic that will be the fundamental line of our work, what is important now is to understand how we are going to answer it. One should definitely take the one question through specific angles, so as to have full knowledge on what one is dealing with. That is why one firstly has to really understand the concept of “doubles” as it appears in literature and as others have already defined it in terms of a literary theme. In this first part of our investigation we will try to justify in what way Orlick really is a double, focusing on what makes a double and how he corresponds to the definition and how he does not. This is when we will observe the different faces a double can assume and also when we will explain why Orlick and not somebody else. This part is an essential one and a personal favourite since it will consist in always coming and going between the original text and the various works of the literary scene – whether other novels or technical books.

Then one must see how science took the idea and revised it in its own terms. While doing this one will run across specific terms such as “shadow” “repressed” or even “subconsciously” proving that Orlick might not be just a simple character but the acting part of Pip's hidden personality in this “universal struggle”<sup>4</sup>. Great figures such as Darwin, Freud and Jung will be mentioned in this part of our work as the former greatly influenced Dickens's novel and the

---

<sup>4</sup> Charles Dickens, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999 p9.

two others will have a paramount impact on our interpretation of the relation Pip/Orlick. Indeed Darwin's revolutionary theory on evolution appeared in 1859<sup>5</sup> just one year before *Great Expectations* was published and one cannot deny that Dickens has made references to such a work as this. As far as Freud and Jung are concerned, since they arrived much later than the first publication of Dickens's novel, one cannot use the term "influence". However, these two figures have to be mentioned for what they did, that is to say putting specific terms on precise behaviours and/or reactions – which will prove quite useful in explaining and justifying Orlick's actions in relation to Pip's desires.

A third aspect of our work will be to really ponder on the reasons that justify the two reactions (acceptance/rejection) to the same problem. This point should be tricky and yet particularly interesting since we get to use Lacan's work on the use of "I" and "non-I"<sup>6</sup>. Indeed it must be noted that Orlick is always speaking about himself using the third person. Apparently he has not yet grasped his true identity and needs Pip to attain "the unity of character"<sup>7</sup> throughout their complementary relation. More than that the reasons that justify their mutual motives belong to the prejudiced mind that has been conditioned, always making people speak in terms of right and wrong, good and evil, upper-class and lowlifes. Pip does not want a villain for a double but Orlick by accepting this other self is given a shot at respect and higher expectations. Moreover one must not forget that the notion of guilt will clearly have a huge impact on our protagonists' choices and it will enable us to mention Pirrip as the puppet-master of this dismal story thus introducing the trio Pip/Pirrip/Orlick.

Finally, one should focus on what inspired Dickens to create this quite unusual pair. Indeed, this couple is completely different from the others in the same story and what's coming out of it is clearly symbolic, giving those two characters another dimension and a substance quite impressive. One cannot deny that the relation major character/minor character can be quite intriguing as we will see one throughout the whole book while the other will make an appearance every now and then, but always in crucial episodes if I may say so. Plus Orlick, as he is one man of many faces - on the one hand persecutor, rival, a remembrance of "home", but also an eyes-opener, a lucid figure, a villain and a repented – his symbolic role and his significant part in Pip's life could not be left aside and considered as a mere coincidence. As he works in Joe's forge, it was interesting to discover the many parallels that can be drawn between him and Hephaestus – here the fire in chapter LIII will have an important place – and

---

<sup>5</sup> Charles Darwin, *On The Origin Of Species By Means Of Natural Selection, Or The Preservation Of Favoured Races In The Struggle For Life*, Dover Giant Thrift Ed. 2006.

<sup>6</sup> Jacques Lacan, *The Mirror Stage*, *New Left Review* 51, 1968.

<sup>7</sup> Milica Zivkovic, *The Double as The "Unseen" of Culture*, 2000 p126.

also between the couple Pip/Orlick and Frankenstein/his creature – in an astonishing reversal of roles – leading us to the conclusion that Dickens has indeed been quite inspired to create the pair.

## I. THE THEME OF THE DOUBLE APPLIED TO ORLICK.

What's a double? Even though we made it clear that a specific definition could not be given, can't we at least draw out recurrent patterns? Indeed we can and Orlick will be taken as our primary example since he is not an obvious double. In this part it will become apparent that several aspects of a double have been assumed by our character making him a perfect representation of such a figure. Moreover, once we have established the main characteristics of the second self we will also try and highlight how Dickens had, from the start, decided that Orlick would definitely be fitted to the role. With this idea in mind we will discover that the innuendoes and the subtext were already in themselves blatant indications that there was more to Orlick than just secondary attributes.

### *1. Orlick seen as the perfect double through the image of the Devil.*

A double, in its larger sense, defines everything that is contradictory - good and evil, black and white – everything that is binary – Adam and Eve, Judas and Christ, narrator and character – and to meet one's double is to let one be the prey of uneasiness and fear. In a general belief, since the second self is the equivalent of the second soul that has been called from the nether world, one of the two has to be diabolical and that is why the double is often associated with evil connotations. When Pip asks Orlick "Are you here for good?"<sup>8</sup> and the latter's answer is "I ain't here for harm" there's already a tension suggesting that the man may have evil origins and that one should beware of such a person. Orlick is not given a chance and is considered a villain from the start and that idea is reinforced when one sees that Orlick has had quite a traumatic influence on the young boy. Indeed, when saying "As Drummle leaned down from the saddle and lighted his cigar and laughed, with a jerk of his head towards the coffee-room windows, the slouching shoulders and ragged hair of this man, whose back was towards me, reminded me of Orlick."<sup>9</sup> Pip already suggests that the haunting figure of the blacksmith followed him even when he was not actually there with him. The constant thought of the man scared him and that tends to make the reader think of Orlick as a bad man and a threat to the young hero.

However since "in Orlick is concretized all the undefined evil of the Dickens world, that has nourished itself underground and crept along walls"<sup>10</sup> one cannot rightly say that he is the Devil per se: indeed there is a big difference between being something and just reminding somebody of that thing. In Orlick's case one should sense everything that has been violently experienced and been forced

---

<sup>8</sup> DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p179.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p268.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., p653.

to silence for fear of repercussions, and the man himself - as we will see right after – will be asked to keep calm so as to not worsen Joe’s position in the issue implying Pip’s half-holidays. Even though it has been stated that “Orlick never seems to be intrinsically evil in himself”<sup>11</sup> Dickens has given him attributes which suggest that certain aspects of the man may fit well into this category.

The evil aspect is also clearly hinted at when considering the names. Since what makes one’s identity is automatically one’s name then in the case of our two protagonists, names will prove significant for an accurate analysis of their personality. What did Orlick pretend to be named Dolge<sup>12</sup> for? Well one might suggest that having a Christian name may give Orlick a greater countenance and a more respectful appearance in the eyes of others. However that also conveys the idea that he feels bad about his name or else why would one change something one likes? So the double name (referring to the double identity of the character such as Pip a.k.a. Handel) might suggest on the one hand the uneasiness of Orlick about his sole origins and the fabrication of a new name could be seen as an attempt at changing his whole personality by giving it a better appearance. What we are trying to prove here is that Orlick is quite aware that he is not a good man per se but deep inside he wants to become one and will do what he can to take the necessary steps and achieve his goal. This will lead to our thinking that he might be a repentant somehow. Moreover when hearing “Christian name” anyone automatically pictures what is right, pure and approved of and in this light it is no coincidence that when the name Dolge was pointed out it was to reinforce this opposition between good and evil which is the key-point to our examination.

Then one must focus on the qualifier Old (Orlick) put against Young (Pip) as it is used to prove how antithetical they both are. Indeed, always playing on the balance of good versus evil, Philip Pirrip uses those two words to make it obvious that they have nothing in common. “Old” might refer to the age and tiredness of the character but that is not it since Pirrip will emphasize the great strength of that man who terrified him as a kid. “Old” then refers to something more, like experience for instance. As we will see in the following part of our study, Orlick might be what Pip would have become if they had had the same evolution, and thus this adjective might just be a clue of what Orlick represents in Pip’s life: an advisor and a mentor from whom one should take the advice since he is supposed to know better. This is quite possible since later in our analysis we will compare Orlick to Hephaestus in such a way that we will prove how he was the one who made Pip the way he is by the end of the book and how he is also the one who showed him the path and watched over him in his own

---

<sup>11</sup> HOUSE, Humphry, G.B.S. on *Great Expectations*, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition p647.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p90.

way. So more than just a threat, Orlick might also be a father figure or a guide to the young hero. But Old Orlick, like Old Nick, means above all the Devil<sup>13</sup> and that proves our point pretty well. “The young” will automatically be associated with the innocent and unperverted spirit of children whereas “the old”, knowing what we know, will signify the complete opposite. Here again is the desire to prove how contradictory our protagonists are in animating them in parallel with the tension between right and wrong – which corresponds exactly to the idea that is fixed concerning a double, the idea of two characters put together in what opposes them most.

However there is yet a point that fails to coincide. Indeed when asked “Would you mind Handel for a familiar name?”<sup>14</sup> Pip answers that he should be glad to have a new name since he doesn’t “take to Philip.”<sup>15</sup> One can wonder to what extent the two can be considered different or similar for if they were really so antithetical, why did they both decide that their names should be a problem? Why did they both decide that it had to be changed? Here is already the first common point that we can draw out and a significant one if I may say so since firstly it results from a decision – a voluntary act – and secondly because it deals with the roots of a human being, what makes him unique and recognizable. As was said before a name is the basis for everything that makes you – it gives a specific image of yourself in the eyes of everybody you will meet in the course of your life - and by deciding to change it you allow the interpretation that you don’t feel right about it and what it represents. Our two characters follow the same crisis of identity for a reason and that reason is that they may mean more to each other than just mere acquaintances. Finally in this idea that devilish hints have been scattered throughout the book, one may also be reminded that “it takes a demon to recognize a demon”<sup>16</sup> proving once more that the two – though conflicting in many ways – might be the same deep inside and that suggest most of all that Pip may not be the little angel Pirrip claims he used to be. As we will see later, the main shift in their behaviour can be clearly identified in chapter 53 when Orlick shows how badly he wants to be similar – quite a strange idea since he has hated the boy all this time – whereas Pip will do just about anything to prove different from the former.

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p141.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p140.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., p650.

## 2. Orlick and the concept of the mirror.

“Mon double partage avec moi au moins quelques parcelles ou quelques aspects de mon corps.”<sup>17</sup> It is true that for someone to be my double, he/she will have to mirror me in some way or another. Indeed, since what I do, what I say and how I am physically and psychologically count for something – meaning that they make me who I am on the whole – this other person is bound to copy my attitude or mimic me somehow and that is what can be said of the pair Pip/Orlick. As the young one is first an apprentice at the forge, he then takes off to London in order to become a gentleman, a higher member of society, and he ends up exactly where he started, kind of like a full circle although he acquired a certain amount of experience. As far as Orlick is concerned, one might say that he follows the same path as Pip, since he too starts as a blacksmith and then becomes [“The last man Pip should have expected to see in that place of porter at Miss Havisham’s door”]<sup>18</sup> and finally he confronts Pip in one last scene saying “Ah [...] the burnt child dreads the fire! Old Orlick knowed you was burnt, Old Orlick knowed you was a smuggling your uncle Provis away, Old Orlick’s a match for you and knowed you’d comme tonight.”<sup>19</sup> Not only did they both climb the social ladder but when they meet again on their parallel paths it feels like they did so to show each other that [“there’s more changes than Pip’s.”]<sup>20</sup> Their evolution being so similar and their last encounter looking so much like a meeting to see how the other was doing so far, the reader is stunned to see that the process of moving on in one’s life was followed *by* our pair but most of all ends up *with* our pair put together in one final confrontation. The last scene is very important because “the circle” has been completed by the two and now they are face to face each trying to get rid of the other in their own way. Moreover, in saying that they’re a perfect match, Orlick himself makes the association between the two and establishes a symbolic link with Pip, proving once more that their presence in each other’s life was of paramount importance.

Furthermore he proudly announces that he has “took up with new companions and new masters”<sup>21</sup> - just as proudly as Pip felt when he started to reject everyone that was not of gentle background – but above all he tells the younger man how he had anticipated his coming to the villain. This connection of their minds and the fact that [“his eye followed Pip’s”]<sup>22</sup> and finally that he was [“repeating Pip’s words to Bidly in the last interview he had with her”]<sup>23</sup>,

<sup>17</sup> JOURDE, Pierre, *Visages du double, un thème littéraire*, Nathan Université, 1996 p16.

<sup>18</sup> DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p179.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p318.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p179.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p318.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., p180.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p316.

all those clues come together to show how tightly similar they both are, how Orlick appears to be a mirror image of Pip and how he thus corresponds perfectly to the characteristics of a second self : they are clearly the same on every level whether it be in their actions, in their words, even in their way of thinking. One must also mention the playful reversal of their roles at Miss Havisham's since Pip is considered to be Orlick's "young master"<sup>24</sup> but the latter will be the one ["preceding him a few steps towards the house."]<sup>25</sup> For the first time, Orlick has got the upper hand on the situation and he is the one guiding Pip physically – towards the house - but also towards his new life symbolically – again showing that it was a right thing to say that he might be Pip's mentor. Then one may wonder if Orlick's crucial "I'm going to have your life"<sup>26</sup> instead of foreseeing what is going to happen in the scene – or rather what *should* have happened in the scene, that is Pip's death – actually states what has in fact happened, meaning that Orlick has already lived Pip's life in his own way. Indeed after having proved how they actually lived the same kind of life, should we be going too far in saying that Orlick may have already had the young boy's life?

Now as a development of the theme of the mirror one must also consider the animality of our two protagonists. In the novel it is clearly stated that Orlick does not speak but growls and we are told that he is a strong man. Chapter LIII does develop this lexical field in introducing the terms "violent shock"<sup>27</sup>, "strong running noose", "pressure", "exquisite pain", and "a strong man's hand". Pip had to struggle when confronted to the man because everything was so shockingly unexpected and uncontrollable; it was hard to get out of. This episode stands in sharp contrast to the boxing match opposing Pip to Herbert. Indeed, as he was not afraid of fighting when he was a little boy, here we get the impression that he is a caged and helpless prey at the hand and mercy of a dangerous psychopath. Plus, Orlick is automatically associated with wilderness as critics often call him "the bestial Orlick"<sup>28</sup>. But funnily enough this man whose "mouth [was] snarling like a tiger's"<sup>29</sup> does not get the part right since he reverses the roles and calls Pip a "wolf". When one should be perceived as something specific but projects it onto another being, one should think that an identification has been made and that a mirror effect has been used to render it more concrete. Here "Now, wolf afore I kill you like any other beast- I'll have a good look at you [...] Oh you enemy!"<sup>30</sup> Orlick attributes everything that he is to

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., p179.

<sup>25</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., p316.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., p315.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p652.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., p316.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., p317.



Pip making the hero a perfect copy, another self of him. Moreover when saying “you and her have pretty well hunted me out of this country”<sup>31</sup>, why did he use the verb “to hunt”? When Pip was talking to Biddy he used the term “to drive him out”<sup>32</sup> whereas here, by choosing this verb Orlick agrees to being identified as a “savagely damaging”<sup>33</sup> animal. There is also the fact that Pip acted “as if [he] were a dog” and later “as if he were a dog in disgrace”<sup>34</sup>. The assimilation to animals was, if not encouraged, not denied by our protagonists thus allowing us to draw one more parallel between them. By the end of the book one has become the other whether in aspects or in ways of acting and thinking or simply in the eyes of others, showing once more their influence on each other and the mutual overpowering of their presence throughout the book.

This part was meant to show how our protagonists, while claiming to be different in so many ways, were in fact evolving despite themselves following the same scheme and frequently meeting on their paths as if by coincidence. However one can see that there is more to it than just running into the other and it meaning nothing: firstly it is possible that deep inside Orlick wanted to keep an eye on the young boy. Indeed by running into him in every crucial episodes of his life, his actions do seem to be a way to watch over him and make sure nothing serious happens to the young boy. Plus one may suggest that Orlick is trying to be a better man and in order to achieve this goal he will try and do everything that Pip did so as to be sure that he is following the right track to be a better man: by saying that one then considers Pip as a model of success and consequently an example for Orlick to follow. However one of the main themes of the novel happens to be “Pip’s delusion” – indicating the hero’s foolishness – whereas Orlick has justly been established as “the prey of no delusion”<sup>35</sup>. Knowing that, one may say that the man might just be a means to open Pip’s eyes and show him what he has become. Indeed, the true Pip (if ever there was one) can be found in the episodes set in his childhood, when innocence and spontaneity were the boy’s key words. When he became a gentleman he consequently became kind of snobbish and completely disgraceful to the true people of the book, and Orlick seeing all that might have wanted to restore a solid ground and get the hero back on his feet by making him stop being so selfish. Furthermore the similarities and mimicry from Orlick might just be a way to reveal himself to the hero, trying to show him that he too can be a better man without any great difficulty.

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., p318.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p216.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., p104.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., p449.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., p439.

### 3. *The rivalry between Pip and Orlick as the cement of their relation.*

“Le Double, vu du dehors, est un rival du modèle primitif, surtout dans l’amour de la femme.”<sup>36</sup>This part of our analysis is meant to show the rivalry that exists between our two protagonists and especially the rivalry over the loved one represented by Biddy. One had to focus on this specific aspect of the Pip/Orlick relationship because it is, among other characteristics, one of the most important when focusing on a double. Indeed, there has scarcely been a pair of doubles that co-existed in peaceful and friendly companionship. Most of the time a double – for it to be considered as such – has to be a figure of jealousy and sometimes a figure of loathing. Right from the start Pip has sensed that something was off between him and Orlick. Indeed he clearly states that [“this morose journeyman had no liking for him”]<sup>37</sup>, that over time [“he liked him still less”]<sup>38</sup> and that at the forge the latter was “openly importing hostility”<sup>39</sup>. On the question of Pip’s half-holidays Joe had to warn Orlick by saying “Don’t lose your temper”<sup>40</sup> meaning that the blacksmith was overly jealous of and easily angered by the little boy. All those hard feelings against the boy had to be hushed up and were thus experienced as a kind of preference and favouritism: “You was favoured and he was bullied and beat [...] Now you pays for it.”<sup>41</sup> Already we are the witnesses of a bad start in their relationship that will only get worse as we move further in the story. Not only, as aforementioned, is Orlick associated with villainy but he is also scorned and put aside in everyday occurrences only resulting in the holding back of his feelings and thus a state of uneasiness and inhibition: from the beginning we then get a clear image “of [a] dividing line”<sup>42</sup>that will be constantly growing thinner or larger depending on the episode and aspect we are focusing on. The main point however is that there will always be if not a clear-cut opposition between the two, then a striking resemblance that will allow us to speak of one in the light of the other hence nurturing this everlasting bond. This dividing line answers, as aforementioned, the main question of what a double is per se. Throughout the book this encouraged envy will only lead to a continually bigger gap between the two, a gap meant to be crossed by one to reach the other and finally feel complete with the other-self. In most literary works (one might think of *The Picture of Dorian*

---

<sup>36</sup> RANK, Otto, *Don Juan et le double*, Petite Librairie Payot, 1932, p87.

<sup>37</sup> DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p91.

<sup>38</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>39</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>40</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., p317.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., p428.

*Gray* for instance) this wholeness with one's double is generally achieved in suicide but we will see that our pair is somewhat different from all others.

When identifying him to Cain and therefore reminding us of the episode of the fratricide, Pirrip is also making a symbolic reference to the Bible and a justified one too since Orlick is really going to kill Pip's sister who is by extension his own sister as we're trying to induce that he is Pip's other self. This act can be interpreted as one of vengeance on Mrs Gargery— trying to get rid of the person that bothers you – but it can also be a means of revenge on Pip as it can be considered as some way to get back at him and hurt him by hurting his family. For argument's sake we need to take this idea into consideration since we are trying to prove that Orlick's motivation is to right the wrongs that society has made him suffer – no matter how inadequately he does it. Nevertheless one may say that the rivalry is not one-sided seeing as the young boy too does feel a certain antipathy for the other man. He says it so himself when confessing that [“he expected to see his sister denounce him, and that he was disappointed by the different result”]<sup>43</sup>. Pip would have preferred if harm had been done to Orlick showing how strongly he feels for him. Moreover, when trying to find a guilty person, his mind automatically goes to the man as [“he felt that on sufficient proof he could have revengefully pursued Orlick”]<sup>44</sup>. This incessant need for revenge over him proves that the feeling is mutual when talking about rivalry. They both want to see the other punished whether it be for something he did or not. In chapter LIII when Pip is in pain we are told that Orlick did enjoy himself. The reciprocity is thrilling and suggests that while different in so many ways and thus creating this enmity, our pair is also showing an obvious likeness making it so that envy for one and pure scorn for the other might be the basis of this mutual hatred within the couple. By reciprocating Orlick's feelings, Pip is only proving us right about them being doubles. Indeed, if it was only a one-way reaction, they would just be mere rivals and that would be it. However, by feeling the same way about each other, they give a deeper meaning to their relation and from being rivals they clearly reach the higher level and consequently become doubles.

Still there is one more cause for the contention to exist and that cause is Bidy. Indeed, the young girl plays a great part in both their lives and the competition defining who will win her over just adds up another reason for the two to be annoyed by the other. When learning about Orlick's feelings for Bidy, Pip states that [“he was very hot indeed upon old Orlick's daring to admire her; as hot as if it were an outrage on himself”]<sup>45</sup> and later in the novel we

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., p99.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., p212.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., p104.

are informed that [“it revived his utmost indignation to find that she was still pursued by this fellow, and he felt inveterate against him. He told her so, and told her that he would spend any money or take any pains to drive him out of that country.”]<sup>46</sup> The measures mentioned prove how bitter Pip is when thinking about the man and that level of hatred is significant when considering one’s relation to one’s double. Indeed, the primary characteristic to any relation to one’s other self is annoyance and later antipathy – it is there no matter what pair one chooses to study. The feeling is clearly reciprocated and easily recognizable in the way Orlick addresses Pip by calling him “Oh you enemy, you enemy!”<sup>47</sup> and telling him how [“he was always in Old Orlick’s way since ever he was a child”]<sup>48</sup>. He sees the young one as an obstacle to his own independence and evolution showing once again that he is perfectly fitted for the role of the double whose main purpose is to become independent.<sup>49</sup> Pip himself is aware of his own condition and confirms that he is an obstacle, as he has always “kept an eye on Orlick after that night, and whenever circumstances were favourable to his dancing at Biddy, got before him, to obscure that demonstration.”<sup>50</sup> This kind of behaviour has profoundly troubled Orlick “How dared you to come betwixt me and a young woman I liked? [...] It was always you as always give Old Orlick a bad name to her”<sup>51</sup> already changing the reader’s perspective as he will be inclined to be on the side of the unfavoured one instead of that of the hero. This is one last proof that these two are not simply rivals but most of all they’re each other’s doubles. Indeed, Biddy is not just a girl who will be courted by two men; she’s the symbol of a specific connection between Pip and Orlick for the latter has loved her for a long time but knowing this, the former has set his mind to stop him from getting her. This simple act on the part of our hero is another way of proving the shift in his behaviour and showing a stronger connection to the villain, quite resembling the relation between Humbert and Quilty desperately trying to win Lolita over. When focusing on the notion of “doubles”, rivalry over the loved one remains a major characteristic.

One always proves to be a pain to the other - whether willingly or not – and that shared annoyance sadly remains a strong bond between two protagonists and especially Pip and Orlick. They both visualize their lives in the light of the other – mostly for harm or suspicion – justifying that they do mean something to each other and this already deepens their relationship even if it is in a context of competition. The jealousy and the envy suggests that one would like to be like the other – and get greater expectations - and by “growing up” in

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., p216.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., p316.

<sup>48</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>49</sup> “Se rendre indépendant” : RANK, Otto, *Don Juan et le double*, Petite Librairie Payot, 1932, p16.

<sup>50</sup> DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p104.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., p.316.

the same way one proves to the other that they can be the same and this blurs the conceptions that had been previously set out about them.

As far as this work goes we wanted to show that the relationship Pip/Orlick has everything needed for it to be one of duality with one's other self. Indeed, for the man to be the hero's double he had to meet several literary needs and match fundamental characteristics of the figure, that is firstly he had to assume several identities in the lights of his "original" which he did: we saw that when being associated with the Devil through many connotations and clues that he could be the evil brother whom Pip never actually had but he also showed that in copying his attitudes and rising in society he was in fact a mirror image (a replica) of the hero and finally we saw that in being most of all his arch nemesis, his greatest enemy, he was in fact leading us to the conclusion that he corresponded entirely to the part he was attributed from the start. A second self for sure, the only thing that differs from the basic description is that he is not in Pip's company all the time but only in specific episodes – but then again crucial ones leading us to the same conclusion anyway. Much more than that, we need to widen our field of research since the work here would look poorly-furnished if it were just that. A double can also be a shadow, a repressed figure, a plague, a creator and a "future-self if". Interestingly enough Orlick will be shown to be all that combined and yet again proving that he has a symbolic part in *Great Expectations*. Those aspects will be without a doubt as interesting to study as our first part was.

## II. WHAT SCIENTISTS HAVE TO SAY ABOUT IT.

We mentioned it before, what makes *Great Expectations* such a flourishing work is that it managed to put together many branches of research such as literature, mythology and science. This last point is going to be our main focus here, as we will try and link our novel to the main figures in science and psychology, namely Darwin, Freud and Jung. We will show and prove how the pair Pip/Orlick is the perfect illustration of the evolutionary theory, as well for the environment they live in as for the behaviour of the characters surrounding them. Freud's work is definitely arriving later than the date when *Great Expectations* was published but our pair is nonetheless an early suggestion that the figure of the repressed, Das Unheimliche, has actually been highlighted in the novel. Finally, as Orlick is continually following Pip, one can also try and link this to Jung's main work on the Shadow of the self.

### 1. *Dickens and Darwin.*

Darwin has often been described as a “tenacious empiricist”<sup>52</sup>, wanting to prove that there was something bigger than just a simple series of events randomly following each other. The term “evolution” describes the development of organisms from immature to mature state and adds with it one fundamental rule that is called “survival of the fittest, (as everything is a) question of competition”<sup>53</sup>. To stay alive, every single species has to prove stronger than the other or else it will end in its destruction by the one with the upper hand. In 1859 Darwin announces that there is in life a “natural selection (which can be interpreted as) a universal sanction”<sup>54</sup>. This idea has arisen many reactions in every domains but one may underline that literature has been very responsive to developments in science, especially Dickens as we will see. With this idea in mind – that of an evolution – everything will work according to one track of thoughts : “the observer becomes the observed”<sup>55</sup>. We will from now on be given the ability to understand everything that is happening – why does this animal look like this one, why does this person stand like that – everything will be put into perspective and evaluated so as to draw conclusions and get some indisputable answers. “Dickens tended to find throughgoing gradualism inadequate and often implied through his narratives the possibility of causes outside the secular. His complex relation to this idea is an important register of the culture's ambivalence about Darwinism and about the extension of scientific

---

<sup>52</sup>APPLEMAN, Philip, *Darwin*, Norton, c2001, p6.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., p10.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., p11.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., p660.

study to human history, and it suggests some of the limitations and contradictions within the realist project”.<sup>56</sup> Both men were known to be revolutionary in their own way as they both put aside the idea of religion being the main ground for humanity. Through science and literature, religion (and consequently God) was not the reason that made everything happen as it is in fact natural causes that brought us where we are today. So Dickens is a man of his time as he represents all the people who have reacted to Darwin's idea. Some would think that it was fantastically true and others didn't want to believe that everything could be scientifically explained and that it didn't involve God at all. Though Dickens agreed with the theory of evolution he still had some reserves as to the extension of the veracity of the whole concept, but all in all, one may say that because *Great Expectations* is a Bildungsroman, one is automatically thinking about the formation of the self and consequently an evolution. Therefore, the link between Dickens and Darwin can easily be made, especially when our author starts his novel with such an expression as “that universal struggle”<sup>57</sup>. This first scene in the graveyard, introducing Pip as an imaginative boy who is curious about the “identity of things”<sup>58</sup> is to us a big clue that Darwin was one of the models who inspired Dickens in the writing of his novel. This idea can be reinforced when we consider that most of the story of Pip's life unravels “out on the marshes”<sup>59</sup>, sending us back to Darwin's evolutionary theory on the origin of species taking place in such damp areas.

To reinforce this idea that the environment in which Pip's story takes place was inspired by Darwin, one may mention that the characters in *Great Expectations* and especially those we are focusing on are often associated with – if not assimilated to – animals, making it unclear if we are reading about human beings or simply primitive “wild beasts”<sup>60</sup>. For example, one may mention the time when Pip is not considered a boy but more like “a likely young parcel of bones”<sup>61</sup>, erasing any form of civilised and modern consideration but taking the description down to the most basic level there is. Even Orlick is presented as a base being as we are told that “he lodged at a sluice-keeper's out on the marshes [...] his dinner tied in a bundle round his neck”<sup>62</sup>. This idea is constantly emphasized with the number of times Dickens mentions that instead of speaking, Orlick “growled”<sup>63</sup> and that instead of walking and standing straight he was rather “slouching” (cf: “Orlick, with his hands in his pockets, slouched

---

<sup>56</sup>APPLEMAN, Philip, *Darwin*, Norton, c2001, p661.

<sup>57</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p1.

<sup>58</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., p30.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., p33.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., p63.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., p90.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., p91.

heavily at my side. It was very dark, very wet, very and so we splashed along”<sup>64</sup> ). The description of the environment recurring in the story is always a damp and dark one, the kind that would see tadpoles and other amphibians grow in it. This sentence is a significant one as it says that “when we came near the churchyard, we had to cross an embankment, and get over a stile near a sluice-gate. There started up, from the gate, or from the rushes, or from the ooze (which was quite in a stagnant way)”<sup>65</sup>; this is what *Great Expectations* is all about, and the word stagnant is cleverly used as the said evolution will contradictorily enough take place in a stagnant atmosphere. So Dickens put Pip and Orlick in this context in order for them to be able “to affront mankind and convey an idea of something savagely damaging”<sup>66</sup> since they will have to struggle to find their place in two worlds – that of the marshes and that of London, with the gentlemen. Even Pirrip says it so (cf: “I struggled”<sup>67</sup>) knowing exactly what word he is using and what it conveys. The environment has been for Pip and Orlick the origins of one and of the other as they both have to fight for their own preservation.

This doesn't affect only our two characters for it would not prove very relevant. However one can assert for sure that “Mrs Joe [...] gets a livelier sexual charge from seeing Orlick imbrued in blood”<sup>68</sup> proving that the other characters in the story have also been at one point or another demeaned to their most basic instincts and needs. Moreover it has been proven that Pip's brothers and sisters “gave up their attempts to survive not in the struggle against their presumably innate infirmities but in that **universal** struggle that Darwin had predicated as a condition of life less than a year before we find out about Pip's brothers had succumbed to it”<sup>69</sup> inviting us once more to make a parallel between Dickens and Darwin. Having said so the conclusion that can be drawn is probably that “Pip is always and only the blacksmith's boy, his struggle is to acquire rather than to recover gentility, and he is not allowed to forget or ever truly escape from his rude beginnings.”<sup>70</sup> The struggle in question is probably the main motive for the writing of the book as Pirrip is always describing himself as having been an innocent little boy facing all these difficulties in life, making him what he is now. The people he met, most of them so rude and animal-like in their behaviour, this helps Pirrip's argumentation in trying to get the reader's sympathy. The more savage the character, the kinder the reader.

---

<sup>64</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p95.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., p104.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., p104.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., p315.

<sup>68</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations, Launching Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p408.

<sup>69</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations, Writing Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p448.

<sup>70</sup>GILMOUR, Robin, *The pursuit of gentility*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p580.



However, what is peculiar in this Pip/Orlick relationship is that they are certainly one of the “many “undeveloped formations [which] have been finally abandoned before its close”<sup>71</sup>. There had to be a point to this relationship but we never quite reach it as it seems to be a loose end. In chapter LIII, the original title was “LIII Out on the Marshes. I am entrapped. I stand face to face with Death. My life is preserved”<sup>72</sup> and the term “preserved” itself hints at something bigger than just saved - as we all know a preserved species is one that has been taken care of in order for it to not disappear. Pip using this word is therefore putting himself in the position of one of those species and in this encounter with Orlick he admits that it might have been the end for him had it not been for this awry end. Dickens has been inspired by the works of Darwin and used them in his novel to prove that he agrees on the fact that “human nature was up for re-examination. We do not arrive in this world as blank sheets [...] nor are we the 'products' of our environment. If we want to know what we are, we have to know where we came from. We evolved, like every other creature on earth [...] we have a nature.”<sup>73</sup> This is partly for this reason that Dickens added so many details that can be more or less easily linked to the evolutionary theory, as he wanted us to realise that evolution is a priority in the world and we need to achieve it in order to become who we are meant to be. So by going through their primal instincts, the characters (including our pair) discover what it feels like to become one's own double as one would be the primitive image and the other would be the civilised one.

Darwin denies the existence of permanent identities or sharply-defined categories. Everything has to develop but not necessarily in a radical aspect. In this respect, Dickens actually differs as his characters tend to be a condition of time and circumstance rather than of “nature”. But there is one more major difference between the two men because “change for Dickens tends to be radical and “catastrophic” rather than gradual.”<sup>74</sup> Therefore, as readers, we are constantly wavering between the fact that the author was inspired by the scientist, and yet he shows that for some particulars he has other views which are quite valid as well. With this idea in mind, let us then focus on our pair and how Dickens suggests that Orlick might be in fact what Pip would have become if he had had a different evolution than the one taking place in the novel. Firstly, as we have mentioned before, one might recall that they both had the same starting point. However, because Pip has been given a shot at becoming a gentleman, he was consequently given the opportunity to rise within society. The only similar offer given to Orlick is that of becoming a porter at Miss

<sup>71</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, *From The Spectator*, p619.

<sup>72</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, *The Descriptive Headlines*, p490.

<sup>73</sup>McEWAN, Ian, *Enduring love*, Vintage Books, London 2006.

<sup>74</sup>APPLEMAN, Philip, *Darwin*, Norton, c2001, p661.

Havisham's. In any case, Orlick was meant to remain in the areas of his beginnings and could not see past these marshes – let us be reminded also that “Old” can mean “the one that lingers”. That is why he remained the “barbaric and non-human”<sup>75</sup> character we know. But what if Pip had never met Miss Havisham? What if there had never been a pretend-benefactor? It is clear that Pip would have remained the apprentice he was at the start of the novel, or maybe would he have become at best an actual blacksmith. This is one more proof that our two protagonists might mean more to each other than what is suggested in the novel. In the great scheme of evolution, Orlick is mainly the basic form of Pip's being as he was not given the necessary tools to evolve properly into a gentleman. But as “nought may endure but mutability”<sup>76</sup> Pip has indeed been through all the stages in his life to end up changed compared to the beginning of *Great Expectations*. He is not a proper gentleman but he is not a child anymore. A mutation has taken place as he stands now in an intermediary stage in his life, not quite the respectable adult he wanted to be and yet a child no more. For Orlick we witness the same evolution. As he changed works many times and followed Pip in the different places presented in the novel, he has risen from his basic status in the forge to become a clear-sighted man. Indeed, nobody can deny that Orlick, in chapter LIII, has not figured out what Pip means to him in terms of self-evaluation. He understands what they mean to each other -that the acceptance of the other results in the completion of the two- and he tries to make it happen, proving how well he analysed their situation. He too ends up stuck in between two stages of evolution – not a monstrous and brutal journeyman anymore and not yet a man per se as we need the approval of Pip to make the man whole at once. In this way, we have the right to affirm that “if the individual is to be regarded solely as an instrument for maintaining the species, then the purely instinctive choice of a mate is by far the best”<sup>77</sup>. The double is a healthy and primordial solution to one's development as we all need the other to understand who we really are.

---

<sup>75</sup>ZIVKOVIC, Milica «*The Double As The Unseen Of Culture: Toward A Definition Of Doppelganger*», The scientific journal FACTA UNIVERSITATIS, 2000.

<sup>76</sup>SHELLEY, Mary, *Frankenstein*, Oxford World's Classics, 2008, p76.

<sup>77</sup>JUNG, Carl Gustav, *The Basic Writings*, Modern Library, 1993, p662.

## 2. *A psychoanalytical interpretation of Orlick's presence, Unheimlich.*

When we focus on Freud's work on the Unheimlich, we can read that this concept goes hand in hand with that of fear and anguish (cf : ce concept est apparenté à ceux d'effroi, de peur, d'angoisse<sup>78</sup>). Because this German term is the exact opposite of "heimlich" which means "homely and familiar", Unheimlich would be consequently the image of the unfamiliar and the unknown, which logically brings us to the idea of a certain fear on the part of the person facing it. We're always terrified about what we don't know because we just can't figure out how to handle it, and therefore we choose to ignore the very existence of such a figure as the Unheimlich, hoping that maybe eventually it will go away. What about Pip and Orlick then? Does the latter fit the description? I would say yes, because Orlick is already scary in his appearance but also in his acts as he is very impulsive and tends to become violent quite easily. Furthermore, as the term also means everything that should have remained hidden and secret but managed to manifest itself<sup>79</sup>, Orlick is simply the perfect character to express it all. He is the type of person nobody wants to be associated with (especially not Pip) and unfortunately as he keeps on showing up in the novel, one cannot get rid of him and ends up acting as if he didn't exist altogether. However one might ponder on the origins of such a figure. Is it something everybody possess or is it simply a product of the imagination? Well in order to answer that question « il faut se contenter de choisir, parmi ces thèmes qui produisent un effet d'inquiétante étrangeté, les plus saillants, afin de rechercher si, à ceux-ci également peut se retrouver une source infantile. Nous avons alors tout ce qui touche au thème du « double » dans toutes ses nuances, tous ses développements »<sup>80</sup>. This sentence means that whatever scares you, it might have one way or another its source in a childhood episode. Whether it be a trauma relating to an episode that hit you while you were young or just a simple fear that you decided to erase from your mind, it is still there in a kind of basement that you have within yourself, that we all have within ourselves. The theme of the double is therefore an uncanny example of these repressed fears, and once again our pair is consequently a proper example of the fact that they might be each other's double. Firstly Pip has known Orlick in his childhood, while everything he has wanted to leave behind when becoming a gentleman has belonged to this past in the marshes. The blacksmith being the past, by trying to follow our hero around he is just actually demonstrating the operation of

<sup>78</sup>FREUD, Sigmund, L'inquiétante étrangeté (Das Unheimliche), 1919. Traduit de l'Allemand par Marie Bonaparte et Mme E. Marty, Essais de psychanalyse appliquée, 1933.

<sup>79</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>80</sup>Ibidem.

something bigger that Freud has been working on : the recurrence of the unconscious, the return of the repressed.

« Dans le *moi* se développe peu à peu une instance particulière qui peut s'opposer au restant du *moi*, qui sert à s'observer et à se critiquer soi-même »<sup>81</sup>. Orlick's main function as a double is not to bother our hero until one of them commits suicide. No, as we are trying to prove, Orlick has a symbolic role in all this. As a double, his purpose is to try and open Pip's eyes, in order for the young man to realise who he is really and see what is wrong with his behaviour so as to be able in the end to criticize himself and change for the better. It is no wonder then that the double conveys with itself the image of something terrifying : indeed, it is a big step for anyone to be as open-minded as to achieve self-criticism. Everybody should be scared of being face to face with one's own flaws. And as part of every type of evolution, you might expect to end up somewhere along the way exactly where you started your journey, which can be quite scary for the inexperienced mind. « Le retour involontaire au même point [...] produit cependant le même sentiment de détresse et d'étrangeté inquiétante »<sup>82</sup>. Once again the parallel between life and *Great Expectations* is hard to miss. As this sentence suggests that the scary part in Unheimlich is the constant return to the starting point, hence the impression of being trapped in an endless circle, our novel has the particularity to start and end in a churchyard. The first chapter shows us little Pip observing the graves of his family as the last chapter presents the same image, only with a hero a little bit older and certainly wiser. The fact that the beginning and the end of the novel takes place exactly in the same spot is in fact a means by Dickens to show us how Pip's life has been taking the form of a circle shaping his personality. The circle in Pip's life (or rather the circle that is Pip's life) and the circle suggested by the figure of “the uncanny” are just yet another proof of the parallel that can be drawn between the relation with one's double and how this relation led our hero to go around in the scary circle of his life.

«L'angoissant est quelque chose de refoulé qui se montre à nouveau car cet « Unheimliche » n'est en réalité rien de nouveau, d'étranger, mais bien plutôt quelque chose de familier, depuis toujours, à la vie psychique, et que le processus du refoulement seul a rendu autre<sup>83</sup> ». Even though he looks scary and acts in ways that are scary as well, let us not forget that Orlick has always been there from childhood to adulthood as far as Pip is concerned. Because he is always following Pip on this path towards self-realisation, Orlick with his constant appearances in important episodes reminds the reader of the fact that he

---

<sup>81</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>82</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>83</sup>Ibidem.

might actually be bringing a kind of comfort and reassurance to the situations encountered. This figure that we have learnt to know throughout the book becomes almost a relief when we see him appear in a scary situation. No matter how hard Pip is trying to rid himself of the man, he cannot lie about the fact that this villain is in fact the kind of monster he's glad to already know. But maybe exaggerating the truth about how much of an evil man Orlick is helps Pip in believing that the past belongs to the past and nothing is ever going to haunt him now. This is of course a naïve reaction as everyone suspects that something is bound to happen and no amount of pretence is going to change this. « L'inquiétante étrangeté surgit souvent et aisément chaque fois où les limites entre imagination et réalité s'effacent, où ce que nous avons tenu pour fantastique s'offre à nous comme réel »<sup>84</sup>. Pip is, through Pirrip's narrative, the kind of boy whose imagination is very wide. Indeed, as we have been able to see him in Jaggers' office observing talking shoes and laughing masks, he is also very creative when it comes to imagining what his family must have been like while he looks at their graves in the churchyard. And as we work on the constant oppositions between Pip and Orlick one may suggest that “these counterpositions, so fruitful of illusion”<sup>85</sup> bring us to lose our balance and therefore wonder what is good, what is wrong, who is in the right and who is not to trust. This young boy has a way of perceiving things differently from your average human being which led him eventually to sometimes confuse reality and what is the product of his imagination. Because he was the prey of illusion, he can easily get confused and consequently he tends to describe everything out of proportion. In this pattern, one can suggest that it is a strategy as « l'exagération de la réalité psychique par rapport à la réalité matérielle »<sup>86</sup> - meaning how different the product of the mind is compared to the actual reality of things - is sometimes a way to win the reader over and make him sympathize with the poor little boy who has to face the giant brute of a blacksmith.

« L' « Unheimliche » est ce qui autrefois était « heimisch », de tous temps familier. Mais le préfixe « un » placé devant ce mot est la marque du refoulement<sup>87</sup>. » This is simply the best way to explain Orlick's role in our hero's life. Indeed as we said before, the blacksmith appears very early in Pip's life and therefore belongs to his past, as a familiar figure. However, because an association must be created (for the villain wants to create a bond with Pip) our hero makes it as if nothing linked the two characters whatsoever. His way of acting when face to face with him proves that he does not want anyone to draw any kind of parallel between the two. Lying to oneself is definitely the mark of

<sup>84</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>85</sup>JUNG, Carl Gustav, *The Basic Writings*, Modern Library, 1993, p98.

<sup>86</sup>FREUD, Sigmund, *L'inquiétante étrangeté (Das Unheimliche)*, 1919. Traduit de l'Allemand par Marie Bonaparte et Mme E. Marty, *Essais de psychanalyse appliquée*, 1933.

<sup>87</sup>Ibidem.

something you want to bury deep within yourself, and consequently we can assuredly point out that Orlick corresponds to the description of the repressed figure. Furthermore let us remark that the uncanny is something *fearful* and *frightening*<sup>88</sup> easily conveyed by somebody who is scary in his general figure and countenance. Orlick does answer the criteria as he is often described as a kind of giant animal, strong and vicious, always limping and with one of his eyes always shut. You fear what you don't know and possibly Pip didn't take the time to discover how similar he might be to Orlick and vice versa; or maybe he did notice the many similarities but chose not to ever open the door to self-criticism by completely rejecting the idea of Orlick being his other-self. But as “*unheimlich* is [...] what is supposed to be kept secret but is *inadvertently revealed*<sup>89</sup>” Pip could not hope that everything would remain that way. Even as far as Dickens is concerned, what would be the point of introducing a character whose purpose remains unsaid? So Orlick follows Pip everywhere but more than that he's going to prove a point and make him realise what the young man has been trying to avoid for so long. The villain's journey ends up showing how wise he has become and how clear this relationship is to him. This surprising and unexpected **self-revelation**<sup>90</sup> that has happened to him must happen to Pip in order for our pair to accept their relationship as each other's double. However the reader can see how it didn't turn out as expected and how this duet has not been given a chance to take it further.

This face to face that takes place in Chapter LIII is clearly symbolic for it is not your average confrontation. As we have proven before, Orlick being the perfect representation of what has been buried in early childhood, by constantly engaging himself in an argument with Pip, he is on a higher level hinting at the psychological experience of the return of the repressed<sup>91</sup>. For he is the uncanny which arises as the recurrence of something forgotten and repressed<sup>92</sup> but more than that he has realised who he was supposed to be in our hero's life and clearly his purpose is to help Pip achieve self-realisation and consequently helping our villain to achieve his own. This is how deep the relation with one's double is : if one can expect to go higher (socially or symbolically) the other then is given the same opportunity. On the whole Orlick, who is supposed to be the arch-nemesis and therefore the ultimate evil, has shown the reader that he has grown-up to be the man who can help the hero discover who he really is. As Pip mistook his great expectations, Orlick on the other end is plainly conscious of his own and

---

<sup>88</sup>GRAY, Richard, « *Freud and the Literary Imagination* », Autumn Quarter, 2010. Lecture Notes : Freud, « *The Uncanny* », 1919.

<sup>89</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>90</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>91</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>92</sup>Ibidem.

wants to act on them so as to become a wholesome person with the help and acceptance of the young man. But is our hero ready to accept such a responsibility? To be actor of one's own existence is already big enough but what about the charge of your being burdened with yet another life bound to your own? «La légende grecque s'empare d'une contrainte que chacun reconnaît parce qu'il en a ressenti l'existence en lui-même. Chaque auditeur a été un jour en germe et en fantaisie cet Œdipe, et devant un tel accomplissement en rêve transporté ici dans la réalité, il recule d'épouvante avec tout le montant du refoulement qui sépare son état infantile de celui qui est le sien aujourd'hui<sup>93</sup> ». So that's what happened to Pip. He simply hears what Orlick has to say to him during their confrontation. He listens to him, probably understands what he is being told but is too terrified to admit that he's right. He then decides to act stubbornly and he keeps rejecting Orlick's arguments to his face, determined not to cave in and associate with him. Simply because he has come a long way since his childhood on the marshes, and because he didn't even care to associate with Joe while on his way to become a true gentleman, why would he give the villain a shot? Too scared to admit that his childhood is still there, ready to haunt him whenever it feels like it, and most of all too frightened to admit that he has done so much for nothing as he is not the person he was to become, that is Pip's inner struggle. He will never back down and become the vile monster he sees before him...but is Orlick only a monster?

« Quant à la souffrance morale, elle est, selon le père de la psychanalyse, toujours la résultante d'un conflit<sup>94</sup> ». Everything is therefore connected. Pip and Orlick have hated each other ever since they can remember, but this hatred has led one of the two to murder and/or hurt the people close to the other protagonist (but still claiming that this was done through the will of the aforementioned protagonist) and all this results in the guilt of the hero. We don't see all this sequence of events when focusing on the Pip/Joe relationship because there is no actual conflict between the two, no rivalry whatsoever. This clash, «cette lutte qui conduit au retour, sur le devant de la scène de la conscience, du refoulé<sup>95</sup> », has been going on for too long and it gave way to the oppressive presence of Orlick. Indeed he was already there before but in a very few episodes. However, as time goes by and as Pip keeps on living carelessly (at least as far as his repressed side is concerned) Orlick grows more and more impatient and makes his presence known finally by sending an anonymous letter to our hero. Then what was just a supposition became an actual face to face and the truth is relished whether it is accepted or not. The said suggestion is in fact that Orlick's deeper aim as a character in the novel is to reveal how he was the inner

<sup>93</sup>VIVES, Jean- Michel «*Le théâtre psychopathologique et la scène psychanalytique*» paru dans l'avant scène théâtre Janvier 2008.

<sup>94</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>95</sup>Ibidem.

conscience of the hero all along and that whatever he wanted but didn't dare to do, Orlick would do it for him without any verbal exchange being made. The accusation “it was you as did for your shrew sister”<sup>96</sup> “I tell you it was your doing – I tell you it was done through you”<sup>97</sup> is the ultimate proof that Orlick is plainly conscious of the reasons that led him to those attacks. He did it as a favour to young Pip. «Il est donc important que la forme artistique dévoile et, dans le même mouvement, voile la nature de ces impulsions, faute de quoi il ne resterait au spectateur que l'angoisse de la représentation sans fard du refoulé, et la colère, le dégoût et la fuite devant un spectacle devenu insupportable»<sup>98</sup>. This sentence explains why the reader tends to sympathize with the villain of the story. It was necessary to treat this question as it is not a normal reaction to side for the evil one and take our distance from the innocent one. Indeed, as we have already said many times about Orlick that he is disgusting as well in his appearance as in his acts, he has his way of winning us over in this last encounter of theirs. The atmosphere is already an argument because the light of the candle is the main setting for the scene: he may be hurting the young man but it is still in an atmosphere which suggests a kind of intimacy. Let's add to that the truths that are being said during this short dialogue, for example how the one who has been privileged has now come face to face with the one who has always been disregarded. We understand quite rapidly that the motives of our villain are quite significant and in a way justified and it is because there is a deeper meaning to the simple scene that the reader is just not that scared and repulsed by such a character as Orlick.

This fantasized inversion of responsibilities allows us to recognize Orlick as Pip's double. Dickens knew that there were always obstacles to be overcome in the fulfilment of great expectations, and that those obstacles must sometimes be overcome violently.<sup>99</sup> This is why some of the people that have been hurting Pip (physically or morally) have ended up injured and some of them have even been murdered. According to the degree of shame they've put Pip through, Orlick bears it as a responsibility to avenge him using violence. Sometimes it'll be a hit on the head and sometimes a house on fire, but by doing this and afterwards blaming Pip by using the argument that this was what he wanted deep inside, it is all a clear proof that he is Pip's double, and more than that, he is the acting arm of Pip's repressed desires. Of course, had Pip not felt guilty one could have said that we were not sure that it was in fact what he wanted, but after Orlick puts into effect Pip's fantasy of vengeance [...] the guilt

<sup>96</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p317.

<sup>97</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>98</sup>VIVES, Jean- Michel «*Le théâtre psychopathologique et la scène psychanalytique*» paru dans l'avant scène théâtre Janvier 2008.

<sup>99</sup>TROTTER, David, *Introduction to Great Expectations*, Penguin Classics, 1998, page x.



acknowledges the fantasy.<sup>100</sup> Pip and his guilty conscience reveal that Orlick was right and that his desires have been fulfilled with the hands of somebody else. So by extension one may conclude that by hurting the people who hurt the boy and therefore by annihilating all sorts of repressed childhood memories, Orlick has become the hero's double and must now make him accept that there is more to them than a mere rivalry. « Comme caractéristique la plus frappante de ces formes, apparaît un puissant sentiment de culpabilité qui pousse le héros à ne plus prendre sur lui la responsabilité de certaines actions de son Moi, mais à en charger un autre Moi, un Double[...] les tendances et inclinations reconnues comme blâmables sont séparées du Moi et incorporées dans ce double. »<sup>101</sup> At one point or another of this confrontation, Pip has blamed Orlick and Orlick has blamed Pip. This mutual instinct is yet another confirmation that they are indeed the same but one believing it and the other not wanting to believe it. Is the guilt really about those murders or is it only the fact that it has now become too obvious that they are linked together and that there is no point denying it anymore? The truth is, we will never know because we didn't have time to conclude this chapter of their lives.

In the novel itself let's highlight some of the quotes that could have led us to this conclusion of the villain symbolising this repressed figure. Firstly the continually violent reactions of Orlick towards Mrs Joe as he said “ you're a foul shrew, Mother Gargery [...] I'd hold you if you was my wife”<sup>102</sup>. One must have imagined that someday somehow he would do something to her and furthermore when Pip admits that [“ he must have had some hand in the attack upon his sister”<sup>103</sup>] there's a connection being made very early already. However the guilt must have been so terrible that our hero must have decided to forget about it in case he would come face to face with an ugly truth. But the haunting feeling that [“it was horrible to think that he had provided the weapon”<sup>104</sup>] is just a mark of what was to come and how Orlick was going to be on Pip's mind all through this story of his. “Mrs Joe's punishment [and the] half-murderous blow on the back of her head, from which she will never recover”<sup>105</sup> is one of the first of a long list of attacks that justify Orlick's impulses and consequently his actions towards the people who harmed his other-self. In the end we are told that “the child is the criminal”<sup>106</sup>. While he didn't commit the acts himself, but because of his guilt - because he steals the file with which the convict rids himself of his leg iron, and

---

<sup>100</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>101</sup>RANK, Otto, *Don Juan et le double*, Petite Librairie Payot, 1932, p106.

<sup>102</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p96.

<sup>103</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>104</sup>Ibid., p97.

<sup>105</sup>Ibid., p629.

<sup>106</sup>Ibid., p653.

it is this leg iron, picked up on the marshes, with which Orlick attacks Mrs Joe”<sup>107</sup> consequently this “guilt of the child is realized on several levels [as] Pip experiences the psychological form (or feeling) of guilt before he is capable of voluntary evil”<sup>108</sup> - one tends to see it as if it were the same anyway and therefore our perspectives become changed and he's not all that innocent anymore. “Orlick acts merely as Pip's punitive instrument or weapon”<sup>109</sup>, but does that make him a better person? Does that clean him of all responsibilities? Not at all because as the double, what we can reproach one eventually falls on the other as well. Ultimately they're both guilty, one for thinking it and the other for acting upon it. The motives and harms have been put into light, the case is closed, the two are linked in the same events, the two have the other to blame for what happened, the two are in fact the same in the end.

It might be too much of an extension to say that (or is it?) but for those who don't want to go that far, let us say that “to explore the manifestations of the unconscious”<sup>110</sup> is a delicate thing, especially in this case. Indeed, for when we mention the unconscious we are often mentioning the experience of a single person whereas here we decided to project this repressed part onto another being. But is it not the same after all? Being the same person or being two distinct characters in a fiction is not so different from the regular analysis. I think we have proven many times that the two are so very similar that at some point we may confound them and think of the two as a split personality or even as a single protagonist. Here this is exactly what we have been trying to highlight as one part of our pair listened to the other part and decided that it was time to fulfil the desires of that said part. Does it really matter if those two parts belong to the same body or are in fact two separate entities? I believe it does not. Furthermore if our aim is to once again suggest that Orlick is clearly the unconscious part of Pip's personality, let us mention that this repressed part coming to life is usually “causing fatigue, and is for that reason brought into play for short periods only”<sup>111</sup>. Did we not before underline that Orlick only appears in a few crucial episodes in Pip's life and is not a regular and constant part of the story? Orlick “was repressed on account of its incompatible nature”<sup>112</sup> but that does not mean that he is to be forgotten, thus explaining the many reappearances. He is “the darker part of [Pip's] psyche”<sup>113</sup> and not only a secondary character, “but, just as between all opposites there obtains so close a

---

<sup>107</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>108</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>109</sup>Ibid., p660.

<sup>110</sup>JUNG, Carl Gustav, *The Basic Writings*, Modern Library, 1993, p6.

<sup>111</sup>Ibid., p18.

<sup>112</sup>Ibid, p57.

<sup>113</sup>Ibid, p73.

bond that no position can be established or even thought of without its corresponding negation, so in this case “les extrêmes se touchent”. They belong together as correspondences [...] they subsist side by side as reflections in our own minds of the opposition that underlies all psychologic energy [but in the end] each needs the other [for the] coming to self-hood or self-realization”<sup>114</sup>.

Finally one may mention that ideally, as the repressed figure “consists in more or less violent irruptions of unconscious contents into consciousness, the ego sometimes proves itself incapable of assimilating the intruders. But if the structure of the ego complex is strong enough to withstand their assault without having its framework fatally dislocated, then assimilation can take place”<sup>115</sup>. All this means that had Pip been strong enough to stand against Orlick and to hear him clearly as he was supposed to – had he been open-minded enough to listen to everything his other-self had to say- the two probably would have come to an understanding and would have accepted the other as their double so that they could have claimed to have achieved wholesomeness together and through the other.

### 3. *The shadow of Pip.*

Following the theory of Freud's student, Carl Gustav Jung, one can for sure announce that “Orlick is Pip's shadow”<sup>116</sup>. This term is significant in two ways as it is first a literal image of an actual shadow (for Orlick does follow Pip very closely all the time) but it is also a metaphorical image. In psychological terms, the shadow is “the long bag we drag behind us”<sup>117</sup>, “that part of ourselves that is hidden from us”<sup>118</sup> that “represents all that is instinctive in us”<sup>119</sup>. In concrete terms, the shadow works following the same principles as the unconscious but with a few differences. Indeed, it is on the whole something that one has tried to smother very early in life so as to not have to deal with it anymore. However after a while “it feels rage from centuries of suppression”<sup>120</sup> and become more animalistic than your usual Unheimlich. The fact that it has been locked within oneself, the only thing logical that is to happen is that it does not evolve as the outer-self does : and since it does not evolve, it remains in this

---

<sup>114</sup>Ibid, p97.

<sup>115</sup>Ibid, p119.

<sup>116</sup>TROTTER, David, *Introduction to Great Expectations*, Penguin Classics, 1998.

<sup>117</sup>BLY, Robert, *A Little Book On The Human Shadow*, HarperOne, 1988, p15.

<sup>118</sup>Ibid., p47.

<sup>119</sup>Ibid., p64.

<sup>120</sup>Ibid., p63.

primitive state and it will grow wilder and wilder until it becomes uncontrollable and it eventually gets out. There is rage against the one who imprisoned it, more and more strength as fury itself grows stronger, and finally there is an impossibility for it to be tamed that appears as reason does not exist anymore in this entity that we have come to know as the shadow. Where does Orlick stand in all this then? Well I think it is safe to say that as well as a brilliant representation of the mirror, the devil, the Unheimlich and the spiritual guide, Orlick does also seem to match the criteria of the shadow. Indeed, he is obviously someone left behind, trying over and over again to reach the surface of humanity but he seems to be unable to do so for he is considered too mad a man to really fit in (madness and wilderness which are supported by the constant assimilations with animals). “The personal shadow” - if we consider Orlick as being Pip's, of course, but everyone's shadows in general – corresponds to a certain kind of “bag-stuffing”<sup>121</sup> : let us say that as a person you are sorting out your life. Therefore, what is good in your life you decide to keep but what you think is bad you decide to get rid of. However how do you get rid of a memory or of something that you can't touch? For the psychologists in favour of this theory of the shadow then at some point in your life you're just going to take it all down to the basement within yourself and stuff your inner-bag with the bad stuff that ever happened to you. But as we have already said you cannot just hope that it won't show up again and in fact it will, in worse a state that the one you left it in as “the story says then that when we put a part of ourselves in the bag it regresses. It de-evolves toward barbarism”<sup>122</sup>. With our pair it does work following this pattern, though there is an ambiguity as to how barbaric Orlick truly is. I'm not saying he is not, but the wisdom he acquires during his journey gives him truly human traits as he too will be engaged in the true purpose of a Bildungsroman, a novel of self-development. If we can use this term of self-development that means that there is a self somewhere underneath this beastly appearance, therefore proving that Orlick does not fall into one category of protagonists but rather represents in parts lots of different forms of archetypes.

The other slight change that can be underlined as far as our pair is concerned is that when the shadow is the topic on the table we tend to believe that “we spend our life until we're twenty deciding what parts of ourself to put into the bag, and we spend the rest of our lives trying to get them out again”<sup>123</sup>. The difference between the general knowledge and our pair here is that Pip is the one doing the “bag-stuffing” but he is absolutely not the one who wants to see the content getting out again. However, Orlick tries many times (in fact everytime he appears in an episode of Pip's life) to stand on his own, always to

---

<sup>121</sup>Ibid., p17.

<sup>122</sup>Ibid., p19.

<sup>123</sup>BLY, Robert, *A Little Book On The Human Shadow*, HarperOne, 1988, p18.

be turned down by our hero. Indeed, the only time Pip actually cared is when he was on the verge of dying, however he just ignores the villain and goes on with his life as if what happened didn't matter to him. It is a shame really because those appearances, though looking pretty banal, have a deeper meaning to Orlick than what it seems, for “most of our literature describes efforts the shadow makes to rise, and efforts that fail”<sup>124</sup>. Consequently, our villain is just the outcast who tries to rise up in society and in the esteem of everybody around him (and most importantly in Pip's) but everytime it is just in vain as nobody wants to be associated with him. That is one of the reasons why the reader feels bad about him, because somehow when reading between the lines, we understand what his fight is all about. Denying him the right to be considered as a human being is one sad thing to witness. I say sad when some have said that “Orlick seems not only to dog Pip's footsteps but also to present a parody of Pip's upward progress through the novel”<sup>125</sup>. The beauty of literature is that everybody interprets it the way they want to.

But if the two are so similar, why did we choose to write first on Freud and then explain basically the same thing through Jung's theory? Well, there is one major difference that must be underlined as “unlike Freud, Jung sees the self as *complexio oppositorum*, where good and evil are simply complementary opposites, each a necessary condition for the existence of the other”<sup>126</sup>. This helps us focus on our pair even more accurately than before : indeed, as we proved that the two were somehow relevant for the other, we take it one step further as we can assuredly affirm that those two are crucial for each other. We can mention those pairs in literature when the suicide of the original has led to the death of the other-self, and vice versa; and here, we can wonder what would have happened if the scene in Chapter LIII had been taken thoroughly until its very end. If Pip had died, would Orlick have died too? If Pip had accepted the assimilation with the villain, would there have been some kind of a transformation and godlike enlightenment taking place? From where we stand unfortunately we can only make suggestions but never say for sure as we are not Dickens (but we're not even definite on the fact that Dickens himself had the slightest idea of what would have happened). Anyway, one thing for certain is that more than important to each other, they are necessary for each-other proving that actually, to some extent, the whole novel relies on the existence of a secondary character else the hero would not have been able to exist. As in

---

<sup>124</sup>Ibid., p64.

<sup>125</sup>MOYNAHAN, Julian, *The Hero's Guilt: The Case of Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p657.

<sup>126</sup>ZIVKOVIC, Milica «*The Double As The Unseen Of Culture: Toward A Definition Of Doppelganger*», The scientific journal FACTA UNIVERSITATIS, 2000.

chapter LIII our villain says about the letter “Old Orlick knewed”<sup>127</sup>, the reader is yet again taken aback at how connected our two characters are. The fact that one had anticipated the other's coming is just proving that they're the same, only Orlick would be more like a “distorted and darkened mirror-image”<sup>128</sup>. [“He, again and again, is one who lurks and lounges”<sup>129</sup>] but this is a frightening concept if we think of him only in devilish terms. What about being the friend Pip has been able to bring along with him to London? Is it really that frightening now? The thing is, a double's motives in being a shadow is to pressure the original into doing something, but Orlick has shown already that one of his aims is also to protect the young man in whatever way he can. In fact he would be therefore “born of alternative shades of light and darkness”<sup>130</sup> and acting according to this, he changes constantly between the primeval beast we've studied before and the all-seeing man we're trying to bring into light.

On the literal interpretation of the shadow, one must mention the episode of Pip and Biddy discussing Orlick ““Why are you looking at that dark tree in the lane?” “I saw him there on the night she died” “That was not the last time either, Biddy?” “No; I have seen him there, since we have been walking here.””<sup>131</sup> Add to that the fact that Pip “fell over something, and that something was a man crouching in the corner [...] [It troubled him that there should have been a lurker on the stairs, on that night of all nights in the year.”]<sup>132</sup>. Orlick follows Pip as an actual shadow would, and as the “suspicion of being watched”<sup>133</sup> grows larger and larger, one can easily imagine how this simple act quickly turns into a kind of persecution on Pip's behalf. The shadow is a scary thing since it follows you everywhere and in no way can you get rid of it. During the day or at night, it is always here. The double in general and our villain in particular, are often identified as shadows because they want something so much they follow the hero around until they get it. The hero however is not that cooperative most of the time and that leads to a kind of conflict and therefore an oppression on the part of the second-self. Orlick has always been established as a secondary protagonist, however our aim is to prove that he is more than just that : in this light, it is easy to spot how he is the only one to actually be able (along with Pip) to cross that frontier between the world of the marshes and the world of the gentlemen in London. Of course, Joe did do it once, but it was different, he was not at ease and clearly gave the impression that he felt like an alien in this world.

<sup>127</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p318.

<sup>128</sup>MOYNAHAN, Julian, *The Hero's Guilt: The Case of Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p658

<sup>129</sup>Ibid., p661.

<sup>130</sup>JUNG, Carl Gustav, *The Basic Writings*, Modern Library, 1993.

<sup>131</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p216.

<sup>132</sup>Ibid., p245.

<sup>133</sup>Ibid., p255.

But Orlick could blend in and in this respect, he proved that he wasn't forcing anything. However, Pip felt it as something heavy on his mind because ["still [...] he could not get rid of the notion of being watched"<sup>134</sup>]. Everywhere he went he sensed that someone was following him but could not really say exactly who and why. He did have his suspicions though and was right about it : Orlick as a proper shadow did involuntarily answer all the criteria this figure implies, meaning the ability to not be recognised but still be suspected so that a psychological work on the mind of the original is triggered, and finally the ability to be there no matter where "there" is (good place or bad place, good time or bad time). "Because he knows a frightful fiend doth close behind him tread"<sup>135</sup>, Pip will discover only near the end of the novel who that being was and how he managed to enter the secluded world of gentlemen. "So a decision taken privately, as a part of one's inner life, to fight the dark side of oneself can cause the "conscious" and the "unconscious" to take up adversary positions"<sup>136</sup> : because Pip stubbornly refuses to acknowledge the fact that Orlick might have his importance in the story of his life, the only result that could be obtained was a drastic opposition in everything, a mutual rage against the other for not feeling the way the other does. Pip wants to be rid of Orlick while Orlick wants Pip to accept him in his life and take the blame for everything that has happened. Consequently, they have totally different objectives in mind and will never meet anywhere to satisfy themselves somehow. The problem could have been solved were it not for the interruption of what was to be their last encounter.

So let us consider this shadow on another level now, more specifically that of the opposition between dark and light. Pip rejects Orlick on the grounds that he is evil and that nothing could ever drive our hero to identify himself with something evil. However "there is an old belief that it takes a demon to recognize a demon, and the saying illustrates the malicious sensibility with which things, in Dickens, have felt out and imitated, in their relationship with each other and with people, the secret of the human arrangement"<sup>137</sup>. Pip makes himself, and therefore the reader, believe that he is all innocent when in fact it is not that hard to see how easily he connects with Orlick. Indeed, as we have proven before, there is always something leading the young boy/young man to think about the villain and sometimes even go as far as blaming himself for the acts of the latter. By also always hinting at his disappointment when Orlick has not been punished properly (as Pip hoped he would) Pip reflects an image of himself quite vile and mean. So after those few examples can we not conclude

---

<sup>134</sup>Ibid., p284.

<sup>135</sup>SHELLEY, Mary, *Frankenstein*, Oxford World's Classics, 2008, p41.

<sup>136</sup>BLY, Robert, *A Little Book On The Human Shadow*, HarperOne, 1988, p14.

<sup>137</sup>VAN GHENT, Dorothy, *On Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p650.

that he might be a little daemon himself? And if not all black, Pip would therefore be grey as he will definitely not be considered innocent and all white anymore. “We notice that when the sunlight hits the body, the body turns bright, but it throws a shadow, which is dark. The brighter the light, the darker the shadow. Each of us has some part of our personality that is hidden from us”<sup>138</sup> We need to recall what we said about good and evil when considering this sentence. Indeed, young Pip is supposed to be through Pirrip's narrative the blameless one while old Orlick is the devilish one. If we follow this binary sequence of good and bad, light and dark, Pip would therefore fall into the category of the innocent protagonist while Orlick would be the rascal : “both are real and together they form a pair of opposites”<sup>139</sup> However, need we mention how dreadful Pip was to Joe when the latter visited the former in order to show his support? Need we mention also how getting rid of the people who hurt Pip was to Orlick a way of showing that he was here to help? We therefore are confronted with two interesting yet peculiar characters as they both at one point embrace the two opposite worlds of right and wrong. “Our culture teaches us from early infancy to split and polarize dark and light”<sup>140</sup> but it will not always be that simple. Already in a fiction we cannot put some of the characters into one of those two clear-cut categories, so imagine in real life. For what we are saying here is not something that only works in literature : what we are showing is that everything that can be said about a fictional character is without a doubt the result of a study that can be done about anybody in the real world. There is no right or wrong because the most righteous person can fail and take the wrong path as well as the mean person can one day choose to accomplish a good deed. Nothing can be categorized because there will always be exceptions, and Orlick being an exception only proves that Dickens wanted him to be more special than just this journeyman from the marshes. More importantly, let us bear in mind that “even if we know only one at first, and do not notice the other until much later, that does not prove that the other was not there all the time”<sup>141</sup> : Orlick has been given a secondary position but primary responsibilities in the life of the hero. « Le poète (Musset) raconte que partout et toujours depuis son enfance, un « double » sous forme d'une ombre le suit, qui lui ressemble comme un frère [...] dans les moments décisifs de sa vie lui apparaît ce compagnon »<sup>142</sup>. And this is the last archetype that Orlick symbolises in relation to Pip. Following the young boy everywhere, trying to do exactly the same thing as he does (taking new masters and such) the villain becomes more and more like him but with the

---

<sup>138</sup>BLY, Robert, *A Little Book On The Human Shadow*, HarperOne, 1988, p7.

<sup>139</sup>JUNG, Carl Gustav, *The Basic Writings*, Modern Library, 1993, p104.

<sup>140</sup>BLY, Robert, *A Little Book On The Human Shadow*, HarperOne, 1988, p10.

<sup>141</sup>JUNG, Carl Gustav, *The Basic Writings*, Modern Library, 1993, p104.

<sup>142</sup>RANK, Otto, *Don Juan et le double*, Petite Librairie Payot, 1932, p27.



protectiveness that could be that of a brother, a brother that would show up only on particular occasions.

Being a shadow, Orlick might represent “the dark side of human nature”<sup>143</sup> on a larger scale but we need Pip to attain “the realization of the shadow”<sup>144</sup>, for all the roles assumed by his double to be amazingly significant. However “the growing awareness of the inferior part of the personality”<sup>145</sup> is only coming to the surface when the person is apt and willing to see it, which is not Pip's case. We will see later how that affects them both, separately and as a pair. Therefore, so far in our work we have been able to focus on our pair on a basic literary level by cross-referencing our numerous works about the double and matching them with specific quotes from *Great Expectations*. To be even more accurate in our research we have also dedicated an important part of our work to the scientific views on this particular figure that is the second-self. Bearing in mind that the dates of the publication of our novel and the dates of Darwin's evolutionary theory are very close, we tried to underline how much of an inspiration the scientist has been to the writer. We can also mention one last time that far from being just another pain in someone's life, the double might be in fact the representation of the repressed, the thing you try to forget about after a traumatising experience in early childhood. This primitive image is not given a chance to evolve and will eventually reappear as strong as ever with a single purpose : revenge and mastery. The uncanny is one scientific interpretation of the double and the shadow is another one. The persecution is brought onto another level when we see how the act of following someone might actually suggest something bigger, more meaningful about the one acting this way. Orlick, not having been given a shot at greater opinions in Dickens's novel, I am hoping to have righted the wrongs in those few pages. However we still need to establish the reasons why Orlick was so forceful on Pip when trying to set up a bond between the two and also understand the reasons why Pip would not hear a word of it. The interesting work after pointing those intentions out, will be to determine what all this changes when we consider the triadic relation Pip/Pirrip/Orlick.

---

<sup>143</sup>SHELLEY, Mary, *Frankenstein*, Oxford World's Classics, 2008, p45.

<sup>144</sup>JUNG, Carl Gustav, *The Basic Writings*, Modern Library, 1993, p99.

<sup>145</sup>Ibidem.

### III. PIP/ORLICK FROM A LITERARY POINT OF VIEW.

After having tried to identify Orlick as a double by thoroughly pointing out the characteristics of such a figure and matching them with our protagonist's personality, we have then taken some time to focus on the scientific point of view on this notion. Now it is time to go deeper in our analysis as we are going to try and understand why one of the two tries desperately to avoid any kind of association with the other, while on the contrary the villain does everything possible to show our hero how identical they are. This part is going to be very important in our research work as it is our means to show how relevant a secondary character can be and at the same time how a hero is not necessarily the good character we were expecting. On a third sub-part we will focus on the triangle Pip/Pirrip/Orlick in order to understand how crucial the double is for the completion of one's self-realization, or more specifically, how Dickens's intentional loose end has damaged Pirrip's total achievement as a man.

#### *1. The reasons why Pip rejects the notion of the double.*

A relationship's basis with one's double is usually either “an opposition or complementarity of separate characters”<sup>146</sup>. In the case of our pair, we can see that the notion is already quite blurred as they are both clear opposites and yet complementary to one another. But as we're only focusing on our hero right now, it is clear that he chooses to see just the opposition with Orlick and not the complementarity. Indeed, as the story goes on, we can see how Pip becomes “ultimately alienated from his own wishes, desires and fears, embodied in the figure of the double”<sup>147</sup>. As he cannot feel anything but disgust when he thinks about the villain, one is stricken by how strong the hatred becomes. The will of becoming a gentleman is slowly replaced by the suspicion that somebody's watching our hero, just as his infatuation with Biddy (and fear of her being taken away from him) is changed into loathing for the man who deliberately stands in his way. Every pure emotion that one can feel disintegrates as the double's influence becomes more and more powerful. Consequently our hero feels that he cannot take it anymore and decides to get rid of this hold by constantly blaming

---

<sup>146</sup>ZIVKOVIC, Milica «*The Double As The Unseen Of Culture: Toward A Definition Of Doppelganger*», The scientific journal FACTA UNIVERSITATIS, 2000.

<sup>147</sup>Ibidem.

this other-self for everything that happens, in the hope that he might be driven away at some point. Therefore we can say that “often the conscious mind tries to deny its unconscious through the mechanism of “projection”, attributing its own unconscious content”<sup>148</sup>. This is what happens to Pip : indeed, as everything is taking a bad turn, he always finds a way to blame Orlick, even though we're not entirely sure he is responsible. Pip projected all his faults onto this double without admitting that this is what he is really. So we are the witnesses of a hypocritical behaviour as our hero is accepting the good parts of the relationship with one's double (namely, rejecting all the flaws onto him and avoiding the trouble of being blamed) but he refuses to acknowledge the man as an actual manifestation of his other-self. This reaction of acting one way and saying it is something else shows how unstable Pip really is and probably how uncomfortable he gets around such a revelation as being associated with a villain.

“Otherness cannot be known or represented except as foreign, irrational, “mad”, “bad””<sup>149</sup>. This is probably the reason why Pip does not want to be linked with Orlick. Indeed, in order for you to recognize the other, you have to admit that he is different. Different does not necessarily mean opposite but this is the case for our pair. We were able to prove that everything about them is always on a binary level of good and evil, dark and light. If Pip were to accept the identification, he would then be, by extension, part evil which would be absolutely contrary to what he's desperately trying to prove with this book. How can a reader feel sympathetic towards a hero not quite innocent and pure? Pip does not believe that the reader's point of view would have been very positive had he chosen to take this step further. So he decides to refuse the notion altogether in the hope of getting free of any kind of responsibilities as far as Orlick is concerned. In our hero's choice of rejecting the figure of the double, we sense “a reluctance to give in to a desire for something other, which can only be experienced in its “devouring” and horrific aspect”<sup>150</sup>. If Pip agrees to being associated with Orlick, he then takes the risk of being swallowed by wilderness. Indeed, as we have proven many times, our villain has not evolved in a human way per se but has remained on a primitive level (this fact has been revealed via all his beastly actions) and if Pip, a civilized gentleman, accepts Orlick as his other-self he might then end up unable to get out of these animal-like feelings and behaviours. One more reason then for him to not adhere to the idea.

---

<sup>148</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>149</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>150</sup>Ibidem.

However as Pip has a tendency to exaggerate everything (cf : « l'exagération de la réalité psychique par rapport à la réalité matérielle<sup>151</sup> ») we must underline in all fairness that it would not be so bad for him to accept this notion of the double. Indeed, as we will demonstrate right after, Orlick is not just a vile secondary character with only murder on his mind. He has a grand purpose in this book and maybe accepting a relationship so symbolic with him would have been the consecration of our hero's life. But this is not the way it is going to happen since “the super-ego projects all the things onto this primitive image of the double [giving an] alternative meaning for this form of the double : a) it represents everything that is unacceptable to the ego, all its negative traits that have been suppressed or b) it embodies all those utopian dreams, wishes, hopes that are suppressed by the reality principle, by the encounter with society.”<sup>152</sup> What we mean by “super-ego” is this tendency of Pip to feel superior compared to the rest of the world. It does not matter to him if Joe's gesture of coming to London is very deep and meaningful : to Pip who is above all this (supposedly) Joe is just a lower human being not worth the notice. As to the image of the double, Orlick obviously corresponds to the above description since he is on the one hand all that Pip is not : devilish, wild and violent. But on the other hand he is also the dream that Pip will never have the guts to fulfil, namely getting rid of the people who hurt him. So it is logical that our hero tries with all his will to reject the villain for the latter gives the former all the reasons in the world to be avoided. After all, who would like to be considered in relation to someone (even something) so vile, or on the contrary someone who has had the courage to do what one wanted so much? By wanting to act correctly in the eyes of society, Pip restrained himself and didn't get to achieve what Orlick did and in the meantime if he had achieved it, he would not have been able to claim himself as innocent as he is asserting now. But if ever he were to accept Orlick as his double, Pip would then be able to prove that he is “capable of self-observation (and) self-criticism”<sup>153</sup>. Indeed, our villain in chapter LIII is basically going over all the episodes that brought them together and he underlines the truth hiding behind their respective behaviours. He appears to be such a wise man in this section because he understands everything that has happened and how all this affected their personalities in the present. If Pip were to take him seriously, he would then accept all the truths spoken in the passage and would come to the point when self-criticism is necessary, thus showing signs of maturity and readiness for the process of self-realization.

---

<sup>151</sup>FREUD, Sigmund, *L'inquiétante étrangeté (Das Unheimliche)*, 1919. Traduit de l'Allemand par Marie Bonaparte et Mme E. Marty, *Essais de psychanalyse appliquée*, 1933.

<sup>152</sup>GRAY, Richard, « *Freud and the Literary Imagination* », Autumn Quarter, 2010. Lecture Notes : Freud, « *The Uncanny* », 1919.

<sup>153</sup>Ibidem.

But l'efficacité de l'illusion<sup>154</sup> is such that Pip persuaded himself that what his imagination sees is the actual truth. Orlick is presented as wildly as what appearances convey, however our hero does not want to take some time to focus on the inside. Our villain might have motives and intentions quite acceptable and grand, but Pip stays focused on the exterior, on what other people might see; and imagine what it would be like if people were to associate them both : this delusion or exaggeration of the reality is simply one of the reasons that made Pip refuse any kind of connection with Orlick, consequently keeping them both from the completion they should have achieved together. *Great Expectations* is a story of moral redemption<sup>155</sup> and as Pirrip tries to explain to the reader how his took place, he positively refuses to take into account the redemption of his other-self. If he had, he might have understood that it would not have been so bad to accept his terms. However, as it is his own story, a story of which he is the hero and which is being told by himself, why should he let anyone in? The acceptance (or rather lack of in this case) of the double as such, is the result of Pip's egotism and refusal to open his mind to people other than himself. The thing is, as the novel has been written in the aim of conveying the image of a circle (first and last scene with Pip in a churchyard for instance) it does the same with the notion of the double. Indeed, by trying so hard to prove that he is innocent and that at some point he did feel guilty, Pirrip doesn't seem to notice that taking into account another's moral redemption would have helped him achieve his own. Everything is inter-dependent but goes unnoticed as well by the hero as by the narrator – who is in fact an older version of the aforementioned hero.

Nonetheless let us notice how Pip presents Orlick as being “the guiltily coarse and common thing he was”<sup>156</sup>, and how the reader might remember that the word “coarse” had been used before by Estella in relation to Pip's hands. The recurrence of the term is no coincidence in my opinion, since it is a first step for Pip in accepting the association with the villain. Nothing is said in vain in the novel and this particular term is somewhat relevant because it was a deep trauma in Pip's childhood when his loved one criticized his hands. So the childhood trauma of which we spoke before is here and now and something related to it is called to the surface when mentioning Orlick, proving once more that we were right in our analysis. More than that, Pip is also showing some unconscious acceptance of the notion of the double when thinking about the blacksmith or else he would have used another word. But the projection of this damaging word

---

<sup>154</sup>VIVES, Jean- Michel «*Le théâtre psychopathologique et la scène psychanalytique*» paru dans l'avant scène théâtre Janvier 2008.

<sup>155</sup>TROTTER, David, *Introduction to Great Expectations*, Penguin Classics, 1998.

<sup>156</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p65.

might underline that our hero wants the villain to feel what he felt, thus creating a bond between them. And in the end, pas d'autre moyen pour s'appréhender soi-même [...] que ce face à face à travers le miroir<sup>157</sup>. This is what chapter LIII is all about : indeed, as a face to face takes place, we understand what is really at stake in this encounter. For the casual reader it may have been a simple problem of rivalry but to us, in relation to the double, it is so much more that we had to mention it. So in this scene, let us highlight one more time that the main point is for Orlick to throw accusations in the face of our hero. He explains with more or less obvious arguments that everything that has happened to him is in fact Pip's fault, because it all started with unconscious desires that Orlick fulfilled for him. Pip doesn't believe any of this and only focuses on the part where his life is in danger. But had he been a little bit more open-minded, he would have understood that Orlick's explanations were quite logical and true, and they would have led our hero to a better understanding of himself. However the constant refusal to hear what the villain has to say led us to a loose end and consequently to a state of a “not-quite-self-realization”, if I may say so.

Why was Pip not ready to listen? Why this constant refusal? Well, the answer is simple : « Comment voir ce dont on ne peut soutenir la vue? »<sup>158</sup> Let us stop throwing the blame on poor Pip for a moment and let us try and understand why he would not hear any of it. Logically, if it is a literary theme, it means that somehow it already happened in real life, therefore, the double is a figure that you can encounter yourself. But if opposites sometimes attract, one may not be too keen on associating oneself with somebody who presents antithetical characteristics. So why blame Pip since he's only having a natural reaction? The society has made of Orlick an outcast from the start, and why would a hero want to accept this man as his double? You have to be ready to change your opinion and I don't think Pip was quite likely to in chapter LIII. All that was presented to him might have seem - with some perspectives – acceptable, but at that time he was just tied to a chair, not knowing what was really happening, and not quite expecting Orlick to say all these things about them. Therefore it was probably on account of the fear and the urge of getting out of here that Pip didn't consider what was really at stake there. The reality is simply that actually « la conscience de soi est l'appréhension en soi d'un il »<sup>159</sup>. To be really whole and to feel so, Pip should have accepted the fact that there were two parts of him, one being himself and the other being his evil-self Orlick. By refusing to acknowledge the fact that he had his opposite not that far away from him, he has therefore not been able to understand himself better and find the balance he needed, and by stubbornly repeating that there was nothing

---

<sup>157</sup>VERNANT, Jean-Pierre, *L'individu, La mort, L'amour*, Folio Histoire, Gallimard, 1989, p118.

<sup>158</sup>Ibid., p122.

<sup>159</sup>Ibid., p227.

remotely similar between the two, Pip is only rejecting the idea of another part of him that would have made him a complete person. But truthfully, his motives were quite understandable.

Furthermore, let us highlight that what is strikingly meaningful with our pair is « la complémentarité qui les lie en les opposant<sup>160</sup> ». As we have shown before, the two are really similar in many aspects and somehow they complement each other in certain situations. But as there is also the same amount of elements which are quite contradictory about them, one cannot believe how in the end they are actually the perfect image of a balance as opposition is necessary for their completeness. « Tout bien y a en contrepartie son mal »<sup>161</sup> and if Pip could understand how much this relationship is needed for the two to achieve wholeness, so much violence would not have been required. However since the will influences the fiction<sup>162</sup> Pip's imagination may have been the reason why the association never happened. By this we mean that when Pirrip gives an account of what he saw when he was a little boy, the imagination suggested is not automatically the truth. If the aim is to gain the reader's sympathy then of course one can exaggerate the reality of things and especially when this reality turns out to be the mere product of the mind. So was the description of Orlick that accurate in the end? Were there really any reason for young Pip to be terrified of our blacksmith? Can we accept his arguments as thorough and unbiased? The mere reason why Pip won't accept Orlick as his other-self is again probably the panic against the idea of being swallowed up in the primitivity<sup>163</sup>. Two directions can be taken with this sentence : firstly, is the primitivity really justified or was it just pushed too far? Let's just say for argument's sake that it wasn't and let's move on to our other point. As we have established before, Orlick presents a lot of animal-like criteria, not making it easy for the reader to really make a distinction between the beast and the man. If Pip merged with Orlick in a relationship of doubles, won't he in fact absorb part of this primitive aspect? Who would want that? Especially if that means taking the risk of never being able to recover from this state. Once more we're trying to understand Pip's motives and not constantly blame him for what he did or did not do. Part of his refusal can consequently be acceptable for that last reason we have stated.

This does not mean that he was not attracted at one point or another. Indeed, “this fear is the eternal burden of the hero mythological; the closer one comes to the instinct world, the more violent is the urge to shy away from it and

---

<sup>160</sup>Ibid., p25.

<sup>161</sup>Ibid., p26.

<sup>162</sup>JUNG, Carl Gustav, *The Basic Writings*, Modern Library, 1993, p67.

<sup>163</sup>Ibid., p105.

to rescue the light of consciousness from the murks of the sultry abyss”<sup>164</sup>. What happens to Pip is that if he ever gets too close to the idea that Orlick might be his double, he might probably be swallowed in a chain of wild behaviours from which he can never get back. Were he to accept the relationship, he might never recover from this embrace with a violent world. So in order not to get tempted, he rejects it as hard as possible, proving once more that the binary tendency of attraction and repulsion<sup>165</sup> is quite powerful over one's senses. But on the whole, part of him might have been willing to give in to the temptation of getting over to the dark side. Consequently, this constant doubt makes Pip hate himself and Orlick as well for the decision that has been made is not the easier and more natural. « J'imagine mon moi comme dans un prisme; tous les personnages qui tournent autour de moi sont des moi qui m'agacent par leurs agissements<sup>166</sup> » is precisely what Pip could have said about Orlick, for the latter is always there in the crucial episodes of his life while our hero does not necessarily want him there. Subconsciously we suppose that Pip knows they are more alike than he suggests them to be, but it does not mean that the concept is quite awful to him. He is annoyed when he focuses on this idea, but even more so when Orlick points it out to him. One can keep a secret but two is too many already for the association to be kept on the level of pure thinking. So by always playing on the thin line between wanting and rejecting, Pip loses it all and decides to hate everything and feel disgusted about the whole thing. In order to help nurture this hatred, the villain's presence remains one major point in Pip's denial. « Une persécution par le double devenu indépendant, qui s'oppose partout et toujours à son moi »<sup>167</sup> is exactly what we are witnessing in reference to Pip and Orlick. Indeed, as we understood clearly that the villain's purpose was to become independent and be considered as more than what people see, he is always, as an act of opposition, standing up for himself, having his own opinions and defending them quite convincingly. He always wants to prove his victim wrong for he thinks he knows better. And as Pip constantly describes Orlick's presence as a « persécution<sup>168</sup> » we can never really hope that these two are ever going to reach an agreement with each other.

Finally we can say that as « joindre la fin au commencement<sup>169</sup> » was probably the purpose of this pair in the eyes of Dickens, it will never be achieved because of this loose end they experience in chapter LIII. The pair

---

<sup>164</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>165</sup>SHELLEY, Mary, *Frankenstein*, Oxford World's Classics, 2008, p253.

<sup>166</sup>RANK, Otto, *Don Juan et le double*, Petite Librairie Payot, 1932, p15.

<sup>167</sup>Ibid., p18.

<sup>168</sup>Ibid., p39.

<sup>169</sup>VERNANT, Jean-Pierre, *L'individu, La mort, L'amour*, Folio Histoire, Gallimard, 1989, p228.



Pip/Orlick is not, at first sight, an original kind of relationship for doubles can be found in every types and genres of literature. Even in real life, the notion of the other-self is simply “the archetype of universal duality”<sup>170</sup>. But the reasons that make them choose to or to not accept the association between a hero and a secondary character is going to provoke a whole lot of consequences, devastating to each one of them that were quite unexpected by the reader.

-

## ***2. The reasons why Orlick forces the notion of the double on the hero.***

The double is never “free”<sup>171</sup> and this quest for freedom is probably why Orlick has always been so violent and unpredictable. When you really want something, you think of it as a fight meaning that violence is already implied in the idea. You'll get this thing no matter what and you will get through the obstacles using everything you've got. Is this not what Orlick is doing? To be recognized for what he really is is the purpose he wants to achieve. However the people themselves won't follow, which will lead him to those merciless acts. Kidnapping Pip is probably the most important one as it corresponds to the revelation of crucial truths about them both. Orlick enjoys hurting people and especially in this scene of confrontation : maybe because he feels he's getting somewhat back at everybody in doing so. In any case, to him pain goes hand in hand with retribution and we can imagine that thanks to this Orlick is thus given a chance to move forward towards his aim. And in the basic sense of the term, getting rid of the people who you hate is also a way to be free. Therefore, we become witnesses of a behaviour whose ends are twofold : getting revenge by hurting the people who hurt you and moving on as you get them out of the way. We are sure that it is because he is not satisfied with the way people actually see him that Orlick as any other double “desires transformation and difference”<sup>172</sup>, a higher consideration within society. As what he is in the marshes is not enough to be respected, Orlick understands that he needs to change in order to become a better person (in the eyes of others of course). The difference we are talking about is not necessarily a difference from everyone around but rather a difference between your former state and your new state. When he starts working at Miss Havisham's, we already see a major shift in Pip's behaviour as they are making small-talk. The pair that was based on mutual hatred has become civilised because of this change of occupation. If they were to take a

---

<sup>170</sup>ZIVKOVIC, Milica «*The Double As The Unseen Of Culture: Toward A Definition Of Doppelganger*», The scientific journal FACTA UNIVERSITATIS, 2000.

<sup>171</sup>ZIVKOVIC, Milica «*The Double As The Unseen Of Culture: Toward A Definition Of Doppelganger*», The scientific journal FACTA UNIVERSITATIS, 2000.

<sup>172</sup>Ibidem.

step further and truly become each-other's doubles, imagine how the villain would be treated. This wish is a simple one and easy to realise but the problem lies in the fact that the blacksmith cannot make it all on his own for he needs the other half of the pair to be ready as well.

Orlick is meaningful in many respects but firstly because he represents mankind's chronic duality and incompleteness<sup>173</sup>. He wants to be someone better but in order to achieve this, he commits vile crimes. He is contradictory when you consider what he wants and how he proceeds to get what he wants. But all in all the main point that can be drawn from it is that he does not feel whole and something is missing. Everything about him is binary in his behaviour as one moment he wants to bring Pip home ("I'm jiggered if I don't see you home"<sup>174</sup>) and later in the novel he ties him up on a chair and threatens to burn him. I think it is safe to say that he is only reacting depending on the results of his quest. If people are nice to him he will be nice to them but if they ever hurt him (emotionally rather than physically) he will want revenge. Pip, by diminishing him and constantly refusing the relationship implied by the notion of the double, only gets (according to the villain) what he deserves. Treat me right I'll serve you right one might say, but as everyone tends to treat Orlick rather badly we understand at some point that he would want to make them pay. But in the end, admitting that he was bullied while Pip was favoured brings us to this ambivalent part when we do not know whether to blame him or sympathize.

Surprisingly enough, Orlick is always speaking about himself using the third person. We notice then that he is having trouble when the interrelations of the "I" and the "non-I"<sup>175</sup> are concerned. If the main purpose of the relation with your double is to attain self-hood, one needs priorly to be conscious of what he already is. Pip does not have this problem for he has been able, through his many acquaintances, to draw a precise image of his own personality. However, Orlick does not seem to have done so as his main problem is that he is not aware of who he is. If he were to stand in front of a mirror he would be one of those babies who would think somebody's trapped in there and was looking at them. But there has to come a time when they realise that this person is in fact themselves and Lacan studied this behaviour in the mid-twentieth century. Poor Orlick is an adult who has not gone through the regular stages as a child and is now trapped in the middle of an unfinished childhood and an unachieved adulthood. This is why he needs Pip's approval so badly, for only then will he be able to think of himself as a double and, in time, as a person of his own. The doubles are deep characters whose "central thrust is an attempt to erase the

---

<sup>173</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>174</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p104.

<sup>175</sup>ZIVKOVIC, Milica «*The Double As The Unseen Of Culture: Toward A Definition Of Doppelganger*», The scientific journal FACTA UNIVERSITATIS, 2000.

distinction itself, to resist separation and difference.”<sup>176</sup> The desire of Orlick is to become a better person : why should he be a savage beast when everyone else is considered normal? Why should he be treated so badly when this little boy is highly respected as soon as he becomes a gentleman? What makes me (or him) different from the other? Not willing to understand why, Orlick just wants it to be over and takes care of it himself. Can we really blame him? While Pip can be considered as a psychological character (always wondering why, and how and therefore) Orlick is more impulsive (due to his primitive mind) and in this respect he takes actions pretty quickly only thinking of the consequences that include him. If other consequences involve somebody getting hurt then he does not care much, but if a better future is held in his acting in the now, well this will be enough to persuade him. Surprisingly enough, in chapter LIII he will still be able to show us how he has become much wiser and now understands everything while Pip is still in a blur. Orlick is therefore not just a flat character but someone who has come a long way from wilderness to wisdom in quite a short amount of time because he is aware of everything, especially the fact that Pip and him are both part of a compensatory relationship<sup>177</sup> and I expressly use the word “compensatory” and not the word “opposed”, because conscious and unconscious are not necessarily in opposition to one another, but complement one another to form a totality, which is the self<sup>178</sup>.

And if one were to use Lacan's work more accurately then one cannot stop oneself from imagining Orlick as reproducing «le spectacle saisissant d'un nourrisson devant le miroir»<sup>179</sup>. For if he constantly uses the third person in reference to himself, should we not conclude that he does think of himself as a proper person? Has he not yet achieved the self-identification everybody should have achieved by the time they're only children? This constant desire to nag Pip just means one thing : it is all about acceptance, for if Pip agrees to the association with the villain, the villain himself will have a personality to look forward to, an identity of his own which he will be conscious of. In this respect, when considering chapter LIII, this face to face would be a sort of «stade du miroir comme une identification [...] à savoir produite chez le sujet, quand il assume une image»<sup>180</sup>. If Pip would accept to see a part of him in Orlick then Orlick would therefore be able to see a part of who he is in Pip and they would both be given the key to self-understanding. However, Pip's refusal leads Orlick to an ever more important feeling of frustration and we can easily imagine that had the scene not been interrupted Pip would not have remained alive for long.

---

<sup>176</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>177</sup>JUNG, Carl Gustav, *The Basic Writings*, Modern Library, 1993, p138.

<sup>178</sup>Ibid., p187.

<sup>179</sup>LACAN, Jacques «*Le stade du miroir comme formateur de la fonction du Je*» Communication faite au XVIe Congrès internationale de psychanalyse à Zurich, le 17 juillet 1949.

<sup>180</sup>Ibidem.

This is only a suggestion but as frustration grows, the desire for violence grows proportionally and there was not much more Orlick could have done to hurt our hero more except kill him. «La fonction du stade du miroir s'avère pour nous dès lors comme un cas particulier de la fonction de l'imaginaire, qui est d'établir une relation de l'organisme à sa réalité »<sup>181</sup> : Orlick has been treated as an outcast from the start so it is not hard for us to see how out-of-touch he must have felt in relation to the reality of things. Who really cares about him? Were it not for Biddy nobody would notice when he hides behind a tree. Probably for that reason has Orlick become infatuated with the girl, because of the prospect of somebody actually taking notice of him. Our villain is confused as to why the young boy has had the opportunity to be loved, taken care of and sent to London, while Orlick (who started off at the exact same point) was not given a shot at anything. One was accepted, one was forgotten, the very notion of being integrated into society is put into perspective when considering our pair. But unable to find a coherent answer, the logical outcome was revenge.

« C'est ce moment qui décisivement fait basculer tout le savoir humain dans la médiatisation par le désir de l'autre, constitue ses objets dans une équivalence abstraite par la concurrence d'autrui, et fait du je cet appareil pour lequel toute poussée des instincts sera un danger »<sup>182</sup> :in other words, because the double wants to have what the original has, a competition occurs and the means to win know no limits as the primitive instinct is brought back up to the surface and our pair is clearly going through that same predicament. Indeed, for Pip should be considered lucky to get what he got in the novel, Orlick had to struggle and didn't even obtain half of what the hero had. Rage and jealousy must then have blinded him so as to make him do quite an awful lot of things, and finally the confrontation occurs when he gets the chance to turn the table and have the upper hand on the situation. However, the conclusion we can draw out of it, is that unhappiness is the sole emotion of such a creature and he would probably have deserved a bit more of consideration both on the part of Pip and on the part of their other acquaintances. « Dans le recours que nous préservons du sujet au sujet, la psychanalyse peut accompagner le patient jusqu'à la limite extatique du « tu es cela » où se révèle à lui le chiffre de sa destinée mortelle, mais il n'est pas en notre seul pouvoir de praticien de l'amener à ce moment où commence le véritable voyage »<sup>183</sup> The real power is in the hands of Pip and Orlick knows it well, thus explaining all the pressure he puts on the young hero. The villain understands that his salvation and the key to his coming-to-self is at stake and depends on the will of the original. If Pip accepts the association,

<sup>181</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>182</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>183</sup>LACAN, Jacques «*Le stade du miroir comme formateur de la fonction du Je*» Communication faite au XVI<sup>e</sup> Congrès internationale de psychanalyse à Zurich, le 17 juillet 1949.

Orlick will only have to look at him to really grasp who he is, and only then can he have a life of his own, a complete independence because in the end « l'individu se cherche et se trouve dans autrui »<sup>184</sup>

The letter in chapter LII is also quite significant for it is the proof that Orlick is connected on some level to Pip. Indeed, he knew that if he didn't sign the letter, Pip would be curious as to who wrote the said letter. However, if he had seen the name of the villain he would not have come at all. When the confrontation happens, Orlick admits that he knew Pip would come to him and that highlights the fact that they are more alike than the hero would like to admit. The trap is set and Pip has fallen into it as was expected by his other-self, only to serve his point right. Anticipation suggests that you have the ability to know what would be likely done by the person you're pursuing (in the case of a double) and since our aim was to prove that Orlick was Pip's double, such a little piece of evidence as this makes our argumentation quite valid. Also when considering the introduction of Orlick in the novel, let us quote how “Dickens is not always so vigilant”<sup>185</sup>. The fact that the author started his sentence by “Now Joe kept a journeyman”, this simple word is quite significant because it is used to draw a dividing line between what has been described and what we are about to mention. The villain has always been different, from the start until the very end and this singular aspect can be seen several times in the novel as well physically, as psychologically and even spiritually. He is not just another villain like Compeyson is but rather a surprising combination of several archetypes necessary in *Great Expectations*. Orlick [...], brute though he is, supplies a consolingly familiar figure<sup>186</sup> for he's always watching over Pip, keeping an eye on an abusive sister, on an unfair uncle Pumblechook and on an excessive manipulation on the part of Miss Havisham's protégée, Estella. He is the one who is going to avenge Pip and who will see him home, showing a face completely contradictory than what was presented before by Pirrip.

And because we have mentioned that his main purpose is to get a greater consideration on the part of society “you might almost as well find the ultimate English democrat in old Orlick, the soured “hand” turning to crime because of his inferior status”<sup>187</sup>. The harm becomes necessary to fulfil a good purpose : this becomes the basis of Orlick's contradictory personality, the basis that makes it hard for the reader to stick to his position as far as the villain is concerned. Should we forgive or condemn? That is still up to every single one of us and it also depends on the reach of our argumentation. All in all the real motivation of

---

<sup>184</sup>VERNANT, Jean-Pierre, *L'individu, La mort, L'amour*, Folio Histoire, Gallimard, 1989, p224.

<sup>185</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations, Writing Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p428.

<sup>186</sup>Ibid., p429.

<sup>187</sup>HOUSE, Humphry, *G.B.S. on Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p575.

Orlick, his main “driving force [...] seems to be in essence only an urge towards self-realization”<sup>188</sup> and I can hardly imagine how someone would reprobate such a design. « Exister au contraire c'est se trouver reconnu, estimé, honoré »<sup>189</sup> means that if Pip stops rejecting the notion of the double, he therefore becomes the first one to approve of Orlick's existence, because he turns out to be the first one to recognize him as someone (not something) worthy of being acknowledged. It is as simple as that and so meaningful to Orlick that it is sometimes hard to understand why it hasn't been taken to an end.

« Chacun cherche dans l'autre ce qui lui manque, ce dont il a besoin parce qu'il en est privé »<sup>190</sup> and obviously Orlick is lacking attention; jealous about the fact that Pip gets it instead, he thinks that through Pip he will, by extension, receive some of it. When you think about it, this is a noble purpose, especially for a secondary character and most of all, for a villain. But as we said before, Orlick is not your usual villain and proves to be quite surprising as our work goes on and his persona is revealed. If we were to push our reasoning even further, we could then mention “the astrum or syclus, the star in men. For the star desireth to drive men towards great wisdom”<sup>191</sup>. Should we dare and interpret this quote, we could say that in a way, Dickens meant for Orlick to have this little star from the start and its goal was to lead him towards the wisdom he proves to have gotten in chapter LIII. However, in order to get there, Orlick had to endure all these little adventures with Pip so as to be revealed to a greater truth, that he has a personality of his own and that he should explore it through the eyes of the hero. Somehow it all makes sense and would be a great undertaking on the part of Dickens.

“It drives with unexampled passion and remorseless logic towards its goal and draws the subject under its spell, from which despite the most desperate resistance he is unable, and finally no longer even willing, to break free, because the experience brings with it a depth and fullness of meaning that was unthinkable before”<sup>192</sup> In this final sentence we find all the answers to our questions as it sums up everything that we needed to say about our pair : Orlick, being the wild protagonist that he is, doesn't think things through but acts without an ounce of remorse with the only idea of succeeding in his endeavour. To make Pip cave in was the main purpose of it all and the logical end to this face to face in chapter LIII should have been just this, Pip finding himself not even willing to fight against the villain and accepting his terms. But as we will try and understand in our next part, the loose end that our pair experiences had probably a deeper meaning than what we imagine.

---

<sup>188</sup>JUNG, Carl Gustav, *The Basic Writings*, Modern Library, 1993, p195.

<sup>189</sup>VERNANT, Jean-Pierre, *L'individu, La mort, L'amour*, Folio Histoire, Gallimard, 1989, p53.

<sup>190</sup>Ibid., p159.

<sup>191</sup>JUNG, Carl Gustav, *The Basic Writings*, Modern Library, 1993, p80.

<sup>192</sup>Ibid., p96.

### 3. *The trinity Pip/Pirrip/Orlick.*

To give more weight to our work, we could go as far as studying one major angle of the figure of the double, that is, “the union of opposites in a third”<sup>193</sup>. Once Pip and Orlick have been thoroughly examined, one could be willing to check the accuracy of one's ideas by integrating a third character, related to them both, to counter-balance our assertions. Lots of people have interacted with the two of them, but the one who presents the stronger asset would probably be the narrator, Pirrip. Because a narrator can be omniscient, he has the power to know everything about everyone. This is not Pirrip's case, but he does know however how things are going to turn out, so he has the advantage of perspectives and he can play with it thanks to his position. Now if we are to consider the “triadic formations”<sup>194</sup> Pip/Pirrip/Orlick “I can only say that there is probably no motif in any known mythology that does not at some time appear in these configurations”<sup>195</sup>. There should always be a third one to right the wrongs and balance things up. However, in this case it becomes a bit complicated as Pip and Pirrip are in fact the same person, only of a different age. Pirrip should have been the necessary judge to reorganise this chaotic development but as he is biased and blinded by his own purpose, both he and the younger self he introduces to us are set against the villain with a simple objective : to make themselves look as innocent as possible by emphasizing the dividing line with the evil protagonist. To take into account those three entities would just nurture a strong prejudice against the journeyman and that would not serve our argumentation for we are trying to explore each and every way of interpreting his existence, while following this trio would make us stay blinkered. Had he not been so unreliable, this would have given us more food for thoughts but he remains constantly focused on this “duality; the opposition of light and dark, upper and lower, right and left.”<sup>196</sup> “The will influences the fiction”<sup>197</sup> and Pirrip's will has tainted his whole narrative with lies, making his description of Orlick undependable and deceptive. How can we trust him and base our own judgement and opinion on what he says? It would be unethical and negligent to have tried to remain objective for so long only to sink in the utmost subjectivity now. Therefore it is my decision to not take into account the figure of our narrator in relation to our doubles and instead, to try and give an explanation to

---

<sup>193</sup>Ibid., p92.

<sup>194</sup>Ibid., p93.

<sup>195</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>196</sup>Ibid., p92.

<sup>197</sup>Ibid., p67.

the pair's end. We will go back to Pirrip's role, of course, but with another purpose in mind.

What happens in Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* is « donc, quand dans les histoires de double, la mort du héros survient par l'assassinat de son deuxième moi, cela équivaut à un « suicide » avec destruction totale du moi où, en même temps qu'il détruit son moi corporel, le héros détruit aussi le porteur spirituel de son immortalité. »<sup>198</sup> When taking our pair into account, we can say that Pip is never really given the chance to attack Orlick (nor the reason if we think about it). The strangest thing is that they hate each other so much but never really do anything about it when they could. However, in chapter LIII the reversal of situation is such that Orlick gets the upper hand, meaning the chance to kill the original. This is quite surprising since the double is always supposed to be the weaker of the two. Maybe the loose end exists because one does not know how this reversed situation should turn out to be. «Le double correspond à un acte de libération, à une délivrance achetée au prix de la peur de la « rencontre »<sup>199</sup> : it's all about power. If you have the guts to at least go and face your other-self, then you have taken the first step towards freedom. Orlick is much braver than Pip in the sense that he was the one to engage the face to face whereas our hero just came out of curiosity for the letter he received was not signed. And the cowardice shown here is only the tip of the iceberg because during this confrontation Pip desperately tries to get out of it, by denial but even physically. So we can conclude that he was absolutely not ready for this and that is probably why the two remain at a dead-end. Since « l'assassinat du deuxième moi conduit régulièrement à la mort du héros lui-même »<sup>200</sup> it is clear that if the scene had not been interrupted and if Orlick had indeed killed Pip, the two would have probably died together for it is usually the tragic end to the relationship of two doubles.

As Evil characterizes what is radically different from me<sup>201</sup> we understand that Pirrip, if his aim was to gain our sympathy, did not want to be in any way related to Orlick. If he had done so, then he would have reckoned that part of him was evil; but that assertion would have been only a mere contradiction with his true purpose of looking like the innocent character of the novel. Therefore the rejection of the notion of the double happens on two different levels : first within the pair Pip/Orlick - including thus only protagonists - but also between Pirrip and Orlick taking into account both the villain and the narrator. This is quite comprehensible for the narrator is only an older version (certainly a wiser

---

<sup>198</sup>RANK, Otto, *Don Juan et le double*, Petite Librairie Payot, 1932, p68.

<sup>199</sup>Ibid., p87.

<sup>200</sup>Ibid., p98.

<sup>201</sup>ZIVKOVIC, Milica «*The Double As The Unseen Of Culture: Toward A Definition Of Doppelganger*», The scientific journal FACTA UNIVERSITATIS, 2000.



one) of the hero, however it does mean that he hasn't reached the pick of wholesomeness yet and still lives in denial even as he is telling the story. Orlick represented for Pip, and thus for Pirrip in present time a very real and urgent threat to [their] existence<sup>202</sup>. Nobody can say for sure what would have happened if Pip had accepted him as his other-self : maybe this would have calmed the villain's temper and in this case, Pip's life would have been preserved. The only problem is, as their relationship has not come to a proper end, this is absolutely not how it happened. It will be impossible for us to really draw a conclusion on the pair as Dickens himself didn't take the time to work on it. So we are only left with suppositions but nothing really concrete as far as their symbolic role for the other's self-realization is concerned. This comes as quite a frustration to the reader and to critics as well, because *Great Expectations* was supposed to be the story of achievements and it presents however an ending that leaves us “expecting” something else that will never happen.

It has been said that “the double is defined as evil precisely because of its difference and a possible disturbance to the familiar and the known”<sup>203</sup>, however can we not affirm that Orlick, being a part of Pip's childhood conveys a familiar feeling and a sense of reassurance when he appears in some specific episodes? The problem with this character is that he is part evil (for he acts on impulse thus making himself quite dangerous to others at times) but his motives are somehow very touching for they come from a desire to avenge and protect the young boy. But whether it be Pip or Pirrip, they seem to be way against the idea of considering the good parts of the villain and they remain blinkered on his flaws so as to extend the gap between them, the said gap being based on their binary opposition of good versus evil. Nonetheless, as much as he tries to reinforce this antagonism “the uncanny arises due to the return of repressed infantile material”<sup>204</sup> and Pirrip does not seem to get how his narrative is full of those materials. The thing is, as the complaint itself hints at his knowing perfectly what he is doing, when we all try to draw parallels with Orlick, he does act as if the parallel were not there. For example, when he underlines how guilty he felt for having provided the weapon for the murder of Mrs Joe, and when we therefore move forward to chapter LIII and hear Orlick say that the murder was done through the young boy, everything makes sense and is related in a clear unarguable way. However, Pip argues in this scene that Orlick is wrong : is that simply a hypocritical behaviour on the part of Pirrip, or is he trying to fool us, or even worse, does he think we might have forgotten the former passage? In any case, one of the causes for this loose end is by extension Pirrip's fault for he didn't let us all the necessary tools to finish our work. Stubbornly he decides to

---

<sup>202</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>203</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>204</sup>GRAY, Richard, « *Freud and the Literary Imagination* », Autumn Quarter, 2010. Lecture Notes : Freud, « *The Uncanny* », 1919.

forget about everything that might make sense and emphasizes his confusion when, to the reader, everything is quite logical.

As we have said before, the purpose of our pair is, in the end, to be capable of self-observation (and) self-criticism<sup>205</sup>. However, what does this loose end imply? Well, the consequences happen on two different levels. Let's focus firstly on the level Pip/Orlick : Pip's denial at the time actions were taking place in chapter LIII, led our pair towards a great frustration as everything has been left (and remains) frozen. Indeed, Orlick being forced to leave the scene like that, the hero is quite dazed and immobile and the villain did not get what he was looking for. One cannot learn any kind of lesson about oneself from a situation like that, especially when the interruption is so sudden and clear-cut. Secondly, on the Pirrip/Orlick level, if we are to analyse the term "self-criticism" one might mention that this notion implies that one has had to take some distance, and consequently some perspectives, at one point. The distance here is simple to guess as we have young Pip and older Pirrip. The adult is looking upon himself as a child so he is more likely to analyse himself and hopefully draw some conclusions. We're not actually looking for only flaws when we say criticism, we just mean any kind of comment that would be helpful for a thorough study of oneself. However, since Pirrip has taken at heart to manipulate the reader, everything he says (and feels) is faked and thus useless for an accurate conclusion. In this respect, even if there has been a loose end in chapter LIII, it is not only because of that that we are left unable to say anything specific. The narrator's narrow vision is also why we cannot affirm that our two characters have had a decisive role for one another. If we consider for instance the short story *Bartleby The Scrivener*, written by Herman Melville, and more specifically if we focus on Turkey and Nippers one can say that "they are also doubles, their moods being perfectly complementary"<sup>206</sup>. This has been said on account of the fact that when one was grumpy and lazy in the morning, the other was cheerful and efficient while in the afternoon it would be the exact opposite for them both. So if we were to draw a parallel between our pair and this one, it is obvious that we are dealing with the same pattern. The complementarity does not operate on the same level of course, but in many more ways than one, Orlick complements Pip and vice versa. However, the couple in *Great Expectations* differs in the sense that from all the literary novels and short stories, they are – if not the only ones – one of the few whose end has not been quite established. What to make of it is up to the reader.

---

<sup>205</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>206</sup>ROGERS, Robert, *A Psychoanalytic Study of The Double in Literature*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit, 1970.

“There are times when Pip lays on the self-mortification a little too thickly, and times when he appears desperate for our approval”<sup>207</sup>. However, let us be reminded of the fact that Pip is not the one telling the story, Pirrip is. If there are times when we feel this self-complaining a little too much, the only one to blame is the narrator and not the character. Then this tendency to exaggerate might be a strategy, but a strategy used in a definite end. Indeed, out of all the arguments and episodes Pirrip could mention in his favour (Mrs Joe's beating, Estella's betrayal, the revelation of the true benefactor) Orlick appears to be the narrator's strongest point because he is probably the one figure that could have easily been blown out of proportion. We might even take it a step further in saying that this could have been done so in two specific ways, first in regards to the boy's impressions and in regards to the villain's physical stature : indeed, not only could Pirrip have amplified the feelings of terror and abhorrence that he felt towards the blacksmith (in a kind of self-ampathy I would presume) but also he could have embellished the size and scary appearance of the man, when only the first point would have been possible for the examples of other people mentioned above. Orlick is an instrument (and perhaps an efficient one on some level) helping Pirrip to manipulate us, and the more he will draw the line of opposition between them, the more sympathy he thinks he is going to get from us.

Many “undeveloped formations” have been finally abandoned before its close<sup>208</sup> and we will never know the reason for that. We can only suggest that it was either because it would have put the focus elsewhere rather than on the Pip/Magwitch relationship, or maybe because Dickens could not simply choose between an accomplishment via the acceptance or a murder via the rejection (and let us note that Pip's murder would have been in total opposition with the actual ending of the novel as the circle would not have been completed). And anyway, had there been a murder, who would have told the story? Unable to certify why it ended this way, if I were to choose I would say that it would have given too much importance to this sub-plot and consequently would have driven us away from the main one. Let's add that the consequences of a proper ending would have influenced the way everything actually turned out to be, much in the style of a butterfly effect. So this end, though quite frustrating, was probably the best way for the author to proceed with his novel. Orlick represents the element in English society with which Dickens never came to terms. He could assimilate the pitiable underdog [...] (since the) author did not put him flat and fair in the criminal department.<sup>209</sup> As a writer, you obviously don't pay that much attention

---

<sup>207</sup>TROTTER, David, *Introduction to Great Expectations*, Penguin Classics, 1998.

<sup>208</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations, From the Spectator*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p619.

<sup>209</sup>HOUSE, Humphry, *G.B.S. on Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p647.

to your characters if they are not special. We have seen before that through little words used carefully, Dickens showed to be deeply attached to Orlick and that may be why he had difficulties choosing the proper end to his story. Something too radical may have pained the author and something too silly would not have been worthy of what the protagonist conveyed. For lack of time or for lack of certainty, it may be wise to affirm that Dickens chose to strike a balance, and decided not go with either of the two solutions. That way even though he may have not been wholly satisfied, he was not disappointed either. However, he did give the villain one stunning final scene and in a lyrical way one might say that this final confrontation is the chance for Orlick to shine as “the light is given to the inner manifestation<sup>210</sup>.” He is bright in more sense than one since we have proven that he understood facts that Pip was not ready to accept; but the action of holding a candle and of standing-up in front of a seated audience (even of one), delivering the lines that make him important and full of knowledge, this is exactly the kind of performance that has enabled this dark and evil monster to show himself in a different light if I may say so.

Old Orlick [...] commits every kind of atrocity [...] and yet all we hear of him at the end is, that he has been taken up for burglary which forms no part of the story<sup>211</sup>. That way, we get some kind of information as to Orlick's whereabouts but Dickens didn't have to take any big risk and ruin the whole development of this double's story. To be taken up does not mean that he is dead, and there still remains therefore some possibility for him either to come back and pick up where they left off with Pip, or try and find his way towards self-hood by himself. However, in no way is it possible for us to suggest that Orlick got back to his primitive state as you do not come from such a long way only to go back to where you started : it is wrong whether we consider it in a psychological, logical or behavioural way. Therefore if we only focus on our pair we can say that « joindre la fin au commencement »<sup>212</sup> has proven not manageable for Dickens to do, no matter his reasons, but maybe to leave things up in the air, and up to the reader's interpretation was the point in all this. If Dickens wanted this from the start, that would prove his genius and how far ahead of his time he really was because this trust in the reader was not something easily found in the novels at that time (and even before). But even if it turned out that it was not the specific aim of this loose end, we can say anyway that Dickens was very smart for so many references to different works (scientific, literary, mythological etc.) are to be found in this single and singular

---

<sup>210</sup>JUNG, Carl Gustav, *The Basic Writings*, Modern Library, 1993, p81.

<sup>211</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations, From the Saturday Review*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p617.

<sup>212</sup>VERNANT, Jean-Pierre, *L'individu, La mort, L'amour*, Folio Histoire, Gallimard, 1989, p228.

story. In our next and last part, we are going to find out how the relationship Pip/Orlick is very similar to that between Frankenstein and his creature, and we will also dedicate a sub-part to drawing parallels between Orlick and the mythological figure Hephaestus. In doing so, we will have our final arguments to prove how the villain of *Great Expectations* was designed to be much more symbolic than what meets the eye.

#### IV. THE IMPORTANCE OF MYTHS IN DICKENS'S NOVEL

Our last part will be meant to prove how truly symbolic Orlick is in *Great Expectations*. As we have seen before that he could mean already a lot of things to Pip, we are now going to highlight the fact that Dickens was inspired by two crucial figures in order to create his villain. Indeed, Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* was published in 1818 and therefore prior to *Great Expectations*, and it gave a solid idea of what a "villain" should be like. Furthermore, our author gives us clear references to Greek mythology in regards to our blacksmith, so many in fact that we will try and see how very similar Orlick is to Hephaestus. Once we have done so, we can therefore announce that this apparently basic secondary character has managed to undertake the roles of many archetypes and has even been so important that he could be compared to the most moving monster of that century as well as to a well-known god. In that respect, Dickens has thus proven how smart he was and how he wanted from the start for his protagonist to be more than just an annoying and scary journeyman.

##### *1. Dickens's inspirational work to create the pair Pip/Orlick.*

As our aim here is to draw a parallel between our pair and the pair Frankenstein/his creature, one can say from the start that Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* [is] deploying the double motif on a fully "human" level<sup>213</sup>. The main difference relies on the fact that the couple Pip/Orlick is the relationship between a hero and a secondary character while in *Frankenstein* the relationship happens with the two heroes. However, as we will be able to see, even if the other-self is not fully human at the beginning, the bond itself has a deep and meaningful quality, giving the two novels their substances. « Le propre de la névrose sur scène est d'être en train de se jouer : ce serait la tâche de l'auteur de nous placer dans la même maladie, ce qui se fait au mieux si nous prenons part au même développement que lui »<sup>214</sup>. This staged unhappiness is shown in the two stories in the well-expected confrontation of the two halves of the same whole : in the two scenes, the doubles are doing most of the talking and the feelings they convey are so well expressed that the reader does not have to try hard to share the pain of the protagonists in question. The author/narrator,

<sup>213</sup>ZIVKOVIC, Milica «*The Double As The Unseen Of Culture: Toward A Definition Of Doppelganger*», The scientific journal FACTA UNIVERSITATIS, 2000.

<sup>214</sup>VIVES, Jean- Michel «*Le théâtre psychopathologique et la scène psychanalytique*» paru dans l'avant scène théâtre Janvier 2008.

managed to reproduce the monologue so accurately that the scene unravels before our eyes and allows us to share this uneasiness the double has suffered all his life. The purpose of the two relationships is that the original “learns to love the man who both created and destroyed him”<sup>215</sup>. Created? Indeed. Of course it is easier to see it in Shelley's novel as it involves a scientist who actually gives life to a monster; however in Dickens's it is a tad more complicated to grasp for the creation is suggested on another level. Indeed, when we recognise that Pip made Orlick, we're just saying that Orlick is what he is because he acted in accordance to Pip's desires and not his own. In that way, Pip has been the basis of the villain's very behaviour and, by extension, his creator. As far as the destruction is concerned, it is obvious that the suffering of these two monsters is just the result of a constant reprobation and eventually, perdition. They are broken inside because they are not accepted by anybody and it is just a matter of time before they destroy themselves physically, either by suicide or by killing their original. Both of these villains have consequently a common point in their decisions to overwhelm [their other-selves] with accusations [for instance] “But it warn't old Orlick as did it; it was you. You was favoured, and he was bullied and beat. Old Orlick bullied and beat, eh? Now you pays for it. You done it; now you pays for it”<sup>216</sup> [and] “My agony was still superior to thine.”<sup>217</sup> The motive of the doubles is to blame the originals for everything bad that has ever happened to them. In both doing the same thing we admit that it is just a common point they have, first with each other, but with all the other doubles. So what makes it so particular with these two that we didn't choose another pair? Well, obviously their reactions are the same in more ways than the one we just mentioned. If we take for example Orlick when he sees Pip in pain. One can quote “his enjoyment of the spectacle [Pip] furnished”<sup>218</sup> meaning that he has a sadistic side when it comes to his original. What about the creature then in regards to Frankenstein? One can mention a slight touch of sadism there as well “while a grin wrinkled his cheeks.”<sup>219</sup> Both of them have to suffer the “alienation from the village”<sup>220</sup> even if the creature is forced to do it whereas it is Orlick's choice to flee from the marshes and follow Pip uptown. But regardless of the reasons, the outcome is the same, they do not remain in the area where they started. As we have mentioned several times before, Orlick is often associated with a wild beast and the same can be said of the creature for “his eyes have

---

<sup>215</sup>TROTTER, David, *Introduction to Great Expectations*, Penguin Classics, 1998.

<sup>216</sup>*Ibidem*.

<sup>217</sup>SHELLEY, Mary, *Frankenstein*, Oxford World's Classics, 2008, p190.

<sup>218</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p316.

<sup>219</sup>SHELLEY, Mary, *Frankenstein*, Oxford World's Classics, 2008, p40.

<sup>220</sup>MOYNAHAN, Julian, *The Hero's Guilt: The Case of Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p657.

generally an expression of wildness and even madness”<sup>221</sup>. Both of them have been associated with the term daemon<sup>222</sup> but many fail to see that so noble a creature<sup>223</sup> can hide behind this wild appearance of theirs. When considering their originals too the resemblance is uncanny. As in Dickens's novel Pip ends up in a churchyard having nothing left, our doctor admits to Watson that [“he has lost every thing and cannot begin life anew”<sup>224</sup>]. Both of them too had to leave their home-town for their personal reasons (“the day of my departure at length arrived”<sup>225</sup>) : for Pip it was a journey to London in order to learn how to become a gentleman and the doctor's reason was a scientific trip.

We have got more reasons to assimilate *Frankenstein* with *Great Expectations* and one of them is the constant alternation of light and dark which is also a specific trait that one can find in both novels as “from the midst of this darkness a sudden light broke in upon me”<sup>226</sup> and “a torrent of light into our dark world”<sup>227</sup> appeared. Both stories are set in a dark atmosphere in which natural light is scarcely underlined, making the surroundings quite scary and therefore making the reader uneasy. The scene in chapter LIII of *Great Expectations* starts in the dark followed quickly by the candlelight, showing Orlick. In *Frankenstein*, a similar scene happens as [“Frankenstein's candle was nearly burnt out, when, by the glimmer of the half-extinguished light, he saw the dull yellow eye of the creature”].<sup>228</sup> The light you usually see is that of a candle and that darkens the room in which the episode unravels. It creates also a sort of intimacy but more than that it makes you think of a horror story. This cold and wet<sup>229</sup> atmosphere in Shelley's work reminds the careful and attentive reader of the marshes in Dickens's work. To choose and set the story in such an environment is really, I think, a means for those authors to put the reader in an uncomfortable position. If it were to be sunny and beautiful, the reader would be reassured but, if the aim is to question the facts and beware of the traps, the setting had to be more dangerous and had to convey unfriendly vibes. The similarities continue to flow as the sole purpose of our two “villains” is also quite similar for we can read that the creature is a “he who aspires to become greater than his nature will allow”<sup>230</sup>, just like Orlick wanted to be considered a better man by the people around him. Whether it be possible or not, we cannot

---

<sup>221</sup>SHELLEY, Mary, *Frankenstein*, Oxford World's Classics, 2008, p14.

<sup>222</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>223</sup>Ibid., p15.

<sup>224</sup>Ibid., p16.

<sup>225</sup>Ibid., p27.

<sup>226</sup>Ibid., p34.

<sup>227</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>228</sup>Ibid., p38.

<sup>229</sup>Ibid., p57.

<sup>230</sup>Ibid., p34.



judge because both confrontations have ended up in the flight of one of the two and therefore we didn't get the ending we were expecting. Darwin's theory can also be retrieved because in Shelley's novel too men are reduced to their most basic nature, for the doctor is fascinated by this “animal as complex and wonderful as man”<sup>231</sup>. It is no surprise to find the scientist's idea there for in both novels everything is as we said before “dismal and wet”<sup>232</sup> under “a black and comfortless sky”<sup>233</sup> : here is the perfect setting to imagine Darwin's research taking place – even though Shelley published her work long before the scientist published *The Origins of Species* in 1859. She was curious about science and she must have known that someone would be searching in this field of inquiry. Closer similarities now would be that both Pip and Frankenstein consider their double as a “catastrophe”<sup>234</sup> and are animated with “horror and disgust”<sup>235</sup> at their sight. Both of the former saw the latter as [“miserable monsters.”]<sup>236</sup> and the only conclusion they drew was that each of their other-self “was ugly”<sup>237</sup>. Both doubles are considered by their originals as a [“load that weighed upon their minds”]<sup>238</sup> as the two are agitated by “the sickness of fear”<sup>239</sup>.

However, as Frankenstein admits that he misses the “scenes of home so dear to [his] recollection”<sup>240</sup>, one can wonder about Pip. Indeed, when Joe shows up in London, the boy's attitude does not really convey the feeling that he has missed him, but it looks more like he was embarrassed by him. Nonetheless as literature has shown before that there were appearances and reality, Pip's behaviour can also have been faked in order not to show how truly he was missing home. “Now at an end, and that I am at length free”<sup>241</sup> the creature's main desire is revealed and as simple as that, we understand that it was freedom, the same reason as Orlick. Their motivations tended to be of a noble consistency and that is what makes them so touching to the reader. Nevertheless, both fulfilled their purpose in harming people and thus the contradiction of achieving a good goal with bad actions remains one of the basis of this parallel between our two characters. “My enemy”<sup>242</sup> is an address to the original used by both Orlick and the creature suggesting that the cement of their relations seems to be a primal hatred and a rivalry nonpareil. So once again we can assess that

---

<sup>231</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>232</sup>Ibid., p40.

<sup>233</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>234</sup>Ibid., p39.

<sup>235</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>236</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>237</sup>Ibid., p40.

<sup>238</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>239</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>240</sup>Ibid., p41.

<sup>241</sup>Ibid., p42.

<sup>242</sup>Ibidem.

Dickens followed the exact pattern of doubles' relationships while getting his inspiration from Shelley's novel. The “wildness in [Frankenstein's] eyes”<sup>243</sup> is a very interesting quote as it is used by Frankenstein himself to describe what people see in him in the midst of this disarray. The main value we can give this expression is that this wildness has previously been used extensively in reference to the creature's behaviour and physical appearance. Therefore, one can say that re-using this term is for the doctor a way to associate (whether consciously or unconsciously) with his creature just as Pip did with Orlick when making use of the term “coarse”. The two can't and won't admit that there is a link between themselves and what they created, but at the same time they tend to apply the same terms to describe both themselves and their other-selves. This is one clear example of this tension attraction/repulsion we were talking about earlier. Even in Freudian terms, we could even categorize those little actions as being flips of the tongue, enabling us to again refer to a previous part of our argumentation. “I struggled furiously”<sup>244</sup> (mentioned both by Pip and Frankenstein) is quite significant as well since “struggle”, as we have also given sense to earlier, can mean on one level this “universal struggle” of theirs, but also this difficult state they're in physically – in other terms their fight to have their place in this world of competition but also the fight to try and get out of the confrontation with their doubles as it causes them discomfort. One questioning reader might ask if those terms are not simple coincidences but to that I beg to highlight that the words “wildness” and “struggle” are not that common and furthermore, what is implied in the use of these terms is too significant to be just an accident. The haunting presence of that other-self is also a common characteristic that can be found, in general in all pairs of doubles in literature, but specifically in Dickens's and Shelley's novels as they are said to be [“for ever before their eyes”]<sup>245</sup>. The fear and suspicion is described in such a detailed and vivid way that the reader can almost feel it as if he were the one being pursued. Dickens was very much inspired by Shelley's work but his descriptions remain quite singular and show another way of demonstrating the oppression at play. “A flash of lightning illuminated the object and discovered its shape plainly to me; its gigantic stature, and the deformity of its aspects, more hideous than belongs to humanity, instantly informed me that it was the wretch, the filthy daemon to whom I had given life”<sup>246</sup>. Surprisingly enough, if we weren't to show our references, one might actually have doubts as to whether this sentence was taken from *Great Expectations* or *Frankenstein*. Indeed, even though it is directly quoted from the latter, one can easily see the confrontation of chapter

---

<sup>243</sup>Ibid., p43.

<sup>244</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>245</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>246</sup>Ibid., p56.

LIII unravel before one's eyes. The description, however, might not be that exaggerated on the part of our doctor as his creature clearly was amazingly huge. However the face and the reference to a daemon is unarguably yet another distinct parallel that can be drawn.

And the similarities keep on accumulating as we can also quote “No sooner did that idea cross my imagination, than I became convinced of its truth”.<sup>247</sup> Here we need to talk about the power of illusion in relation to the hero. Indeed, this sentence implies that when it comes to the villain of the story, there is no need to weigh the pros and cons and to reflect too much on the matter, for the guilty one has to be him. There is no reliability whatsoever as the original is blinded by the power of his own mind and imagination. And furthermore, when the doctor says “He was the murderer ! I could not doubt it”<sup>248</sup> this is once again an indisputable resemblance that we must not consider a coincidence. When Pip admits that he wanted Orlick to be severely punished and mentioned later his disappointment at its not having happened the way he had hoped, we can easily recall the petty reaction of Frankenstein when Justine was being tried and he wanted the creature to be held responsible. In both cases, it turned out that both were actually guilty of the crimes in question, however it does not erase the fact that both the originals abused their intuitions and tended to want to see their other-selves suffer more than they should, even if they didn't deserve it. “You are all mistaken ! I know the murderer. Justine, poor, good Justine is innocent.”<sup>249</sup> By saying so, Frankenstein clearly reminds us of this episode when Pip admits that deep inside he had a feeling that the guilty one was Orlick. His wish for him to be punished was so extreme that the reader did not quite feel at ease with all this hatred. However, one must admit that even if revenge was their main driving force, they were right in the end for the two were guilty of the crimes committed. But our point here is only to prove how their desire to accuse the other of something nobody's really sure they committed can come over them and blind them to the point of becoming unreliable. Our crucial argument is based nonetheless on this sentence : “Remorse extinguished every hope. I had been the author of unalterable evils<sup>250</sup>”. Here, our parallel is finalised and justified for it is obvious after all we have said that the two originals share the feeling of guilt. Indeed, after their doubles (but let's keep in mind that to them they're not their doubles !) have committed a severe crime, the two somehow find a way to blame themselves for it. Therefore, there is a bond between the two (the two heroes and the two pairs as well) that they only start to acknowledge once a murder has happened. Nevertheless, the important thing is

---

<sup>247</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>248</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>249</sup>Ibid., p59.

<sup>250</sup>Ibid., p70.

to be aware of it and at this point in their respective story both of them begin to see how they might not be that alien to one another. “I, not in deed, but in effect, was the true murderer<sup>251</sup>” : this admission is a significant one as Frankenstein admits that by extension, he is the guilty party of this whole tragedy. Even if he is not the murderer per se, he has given birth to the murderer and therefore must share a part of the culpability. Pip reacts the same way but, as we have seen before, he only admits it when he is the one saying it. However when Orlick happens to say it, suddenly this fact isn't true anymore and Pip is innocent no matter what.

Furthermore we once again recall how many times both Orlick and the creature have been associated with “the devil”<sup>252</sup> by being called so. Even though this expression looks rather common, the meaning behind it is quite significant in regards to our protagonists. In the two stories the originals wanted to widen the gap between basically “what I am and how much different I am from this monster”. If the purpose is to play with the contraries, then what comes opposite to the devil is an angel, meaning that the original wants to be considered as such. This is all a strategy and never can we think that it was done lightly. One major common point between the novels is also the fact that both at some point are compared to an “animal”<sup>253</sup>. This dehumanization is clearly a way to put even more distance between the originals and their doubles as it would put in opposition the civilised world (or men who have been raised in this world) and the uncivilised, wild world in which those creatures belong. By suggesting a split reality of two different environments, our heroes insist on the fact that two people coming from two different worlds can never be associated as it would be offensive and improbable. “My abhorrence of this fiend cannot be conceived”<sup>254</sup> : again here an extreme loathing for the creature is stressed, as extreme perhaps as the ardour with which our doctor created it. If we think in terms of compensatory relationship, we can link the fervour for the creation to the huge hatred for the creature. The beginning and the outcome of Frankenstein's experiment reflects the same powerful amount of feelings for the object in question but the symmetry operates as the earlier sentiment was excitement and the later one was disgust. We can even go as far as to say that the term passion would be more than adequate. Indeed, as this term can signify both the extreme love of something/somebody and on the contrary an extreme pain (like the passion of Christ) here this word would find a perfect spot because it could be used for the whole duration of the process of “birth” and “growth” of the creature. The only difference that can be noted between our two heroes is

---

<sup>251</sup>Ibid., p72.

<sup>252</sup>Ibid., p56.

<sup>253</sup>Ibid., p57.

<sup>254</sup>Ibid., p71.

that Frankenstein has had a shift in his way of thinking. As Pip always considered Orlick as a human being (saying “he” all the time when speaking about him) our scientist used to call his creature “it” before changing his approach and saying “HE approached , HIS countenance”<sup>255</sup>. The dehumanization that was taking place before has suddenly turned into a re-humanization of the double. No longer an animal or an “it”, the creature becomes eventually (and finally !) a person.

The ugliness<sup>256</sup> is still a common feature of our two doubles though and this physical unattractiveness has been a cause for unhappiness as both of them never meant to be ugly but suffer from it all the time as they need to hide themselves as much as possible from their villages. Even though Orlick does go out and meet people, we can imagine that his hideousness must have prompted them to prefer if he wasn't there. And as far as the creature is concerned, he had to flee the village proving once again that the inhabitants in the two novels rejected the two “villains” primarily for their physical appearances. “Anger and hatred<sup>257</sup> detestation and contempt<sup>258</sup>”, there are many words that Frankenstein uses to describe how much he hates his creature. What we will try to underline now is the shallow aspect of our hero (a demonstration of the super-ego we mentioned earlier with Pirrip). To start with, one can wonder what happened that made him go from extreme enthusiasm to profound aversion. Well, one would be right to say that the only thing that has happened is that the creature turned out to be frightful. With all those pieces of skins and scars, Frankenstein realised how ugly his creature was and that made him curse him/it. Having said that, can we not conclude that our hero is a shallow kind of hero? Indeed, if there is only the appearance of a man to make him change his mind then there is no real sympathy that we can feel for him. However, the creature, by telling us its story has shown to be quite deep, and very emotional, rendering us inclined to defend it rather than its creator. If the latter had been more open-minded and more sympathetic (like Pip should have been with Orlick) our two originals would have discovered how profoundly beautiful and important their other-selves are, for in the end, they do raise a certain “curiosity and compassion”<sup>259</sup>. “And oh! That I could, with the extinction of your miserable existence, restore these victims whom you have so diabolically murdered”<sup>260</sup> : the guilt that is conveyed by this sentence simply reminds us that both Frankenstein and Pip have seen how people have died because of them. It is not their fault per se, since they were not the ones who committed the crime, however because they angered the

---

<sup>255</sup>Ibid., p75.

<sup>256</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>257</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>258</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>259</sup>Ibid., p187.

<sup>260</sup>Ibid., p77.

inner beast of their doubles, people have suffered so as to make the originals pay for their behaviours : both works, Shelley's and Dickens's, unravel following the same scheme. And when we read “I expected this reception”<sup>261</sup> here again we can draw a clear parallel between Orlick and the creature. Indeed, as we have said before that Orlick's letter urging Pip to come and meet, is a symbol of how connected our pair is – especially if we take into account the fact that the villain had anticipated the hero's coming – Shelley's pair works the same way, using anticipation and projection to show how well one knows the other. And because the creature says “all men hate the wretched; how then, must I be hated ... yet you, my creator, detest and spurn me, thy creature, to whom thou art bound by ties only dissoluble by the annihilation of one of us”<sup>262</sup>, the reader is automatically drawn back to chapter LIII of *Great Expectations* when the truth is getting out and we learn how the relationship with a double operates. This chapter has been a means for Orlick to prove how wise he has become and how profound a character he can be. With the creature, it is no different for we can hear the self-pity (“how then, must I be hated” the creature would say and “you was favoured and he was bullied” Orlick had said), the blame which is thrown in the face of the original (“you detest and spurn me, thy creature” vs “you was always in Orlick's way”) and finally the will of getting rid of one to allow the existence of the other. Both villains have reached the point of true knowledge as they both understand what is at stake in this relationship with their other-selves : if they don't annihilate them they will then have to disappear for the two cannot exist if both don't accept the bond that unites them. Clearly their originals won't and the doubles were able to draw the logical conclusion, showing insight.

Remember, thou hast made me more powerful than thyself<sup>263</sup>. As far as the creature is concerned, the power mentioned here is mainly due to the size and strength of all the body-parts that have been put together by Frankenstein. For Orlick, there is physical strength of course, however the reasons for this power is mainly his own product. But more than just this, can we not also talk about some psychological origins to this force? I mean by this, that all the anger and repressed frustration, the sadness and loneliness, all this had to have an outcome someday, somehow. Here I think it would be right to say that both “villains” are this aggressive because they have been their originals' underdogs and have now found a way to make them feel this oppression through physical means. As “misery made me a fiend”<sup>264</sup> (so says the creature) we can link this idea with the sentence “evil became my good” proving that both Orlick and the

---

<sup>261</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>262</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>263</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>264</sup>Ibid., p78.

creature have had the same impulse in the end. Indeed, as they were both feeling lonely without even knowing why people kept rejecting them, they decided to seek revenge and hurt the people who hurt them. To use violence in order to seek fairness seems an idea quite contradictory to the regular way of thinking, nonetheless the intentions of our two villains being so meaningful, the reader does not know anymore if he should feel appalled by their behaviours or on the contrary if he should sympathise. “We are enemies”<sup>265</sup> is the summary of what a pair of doubles is : the rivalry is clear and does not need to be described any further as one has had a good life and the other was bound to live in misery. The jealousy and envy that are felt on the part of the second-self makes him hate the original and makes him want to hurt him. What we can say about our two doubles is that they do not fear to be sincere and they admit they feel that the other represents the foe. The two of them are so passionate that they never feel the need to hide their feelings anymore. For so long they had to swallow their pride and endure their fate but now that the confrontation has come, it is time for them to be honest and they do not hesitate to use violence in their words (and more) to make sure the original understands how it feels to have to remain silent. “You, my creator, abhor me”<sup>266</sup> : the coming to the conclusion that the one that has made the other is not satisfied with the result and decides to try and forget about it is only something that happens in *Frankenstein*. Or is it? As Pip has always been the main protagonist, the one everyone focused on, Orlick decided to become like him. Can we not then say that, in a way, Pip has been a model and has moulded the villain into what he has become? Even if he wasn't conscious of it, Pip created Orlick and everytime he is face to face with him he is so scared of him that he decides to ignore his presence. There is a great deal of parallels between Shelley's novel and Dickens's and the only major difference we can draw out is that the pair of the former is a pair made of two main protagonists while the latter has chosen to pick his hero and a secondary character just to see what lengths he could go to.

When the creature says “let your compassion be moved, and do not disdain me”<sup>267</sup> one can wonder if he addresses only his original or the reader as well. It is aware of the significance of its purpose and just wants to show everyone how it is not the monster it was said to be. Orlick, in a similar way, has become a monster because nothing went the way he expected, but deep inside, his aim was to become a better person and if people could see only that then that would be a step further in our villain's journey through life. This is the deepest similarity you can find with those two for they did commit atrocities but only because they were misunderstood. That is why the reader should “be moved” by

---

<sup>265</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>266</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>267</sup>Ibidem.

their respective stories. “Cursed be the day, abhorred devil, in which you first saw light<sup>268</sup>” : this is a violent thing to say, especially when you are the one who gave life to the person in question. Pip and Frankenstein have had the same wish, to have never met with such a figure, but this is because they have never taken the time to truly realise how important these two would be to their evolution. The stubbornness leads to frustration and a violent desire to be rid of the object responsible for it all. “I felt what the duties of a creator towards his creature were, and I ought to render him happy before I complained of his wickedness<sup>269</sup>” : with this sentence however, Frankenstein finally admits that he has some kind of responsibilities towards his creature. Pip never went that far. He did listen to what Orlick had to say but just because there was nothing else he could do, not because he thought he owed it to him. And as we go on with our story we discover that the monologue of the creature is heart-breaking for it involves a truthfulness and a loneliness hardly expected by the reader. We are then able to read such things as “finding myself so desolate”<sup>270</sup> “I was poor, helpless<sup>271</sup>” “I sat down and wept<sup>272</sup>”. Imagine this huge monster, ugly and very strong, so strong in fact that it could break anything without even trying hard. Imagine it in such a state of solitude that it made it cry. No wonder the reader changes his mind when considering a moment like that, because it would be really unlikely that someone wouldn't be moved by this confession. Orlick didn't go as far as admitting that he cried, however he did mention the seclusion and the uneasiness that made his life a complete nightmare compared to Pip's life as a gentleman.

Later in the story, when the creature says it “found a fire and was overcome with delight at the warmth [it] experienced from it<sup>273</sup>” we may then underline an interesting resemblance between Shelley's villain and Orlick. Indeed, the latter being a blacksmith, we can already imagine how he has always had a close relationship with fire. The flames are, in a way, a remembrance of home to the two villains because it is where they feel accepted and warm. “I examined the materials of the fire”<sup>274</sup> points out the curiosity of the creature concerning the fire. Being a blacksmith suggests that you have come to know how the flames work and that you have satisfied the curiosity that your job involves. Therefore, it is obvious that the two villains have been at some point

---

<sup>268</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>269</sup>Ibid., p79.

<sup>270</sup>Ibid., p80.

<sup>271</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>272</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>273</sup>Ibid., p81.

<sup>274</sup>Ibidem.



animated by the same feeling as far as the operation of the fire<sup>275</sup> is concerned. The creature keeps on insisting on this interest as it “reflected on this”<sup>276</sup> and as its “first care was to visit the fire”<sup>277</sup>. Everything in this life of forlornness happens near a fire<sup>278</sup> as if the light were a means to literally bring to light [the monsters that they are]<sup>279</sup>. Let us go back to one important thing concerning this relationship with the fire : as the creature “lighted the dry branch of a tree”<sup>280</sup> and “fired”<sup>281</sup>, this is clearly a means to feel secure and at home against this dreadful situation it is in. Only there could our villains find peace and time to understand the reasons why they were treated this way. The solitude and reflection has only led to one conclusion “I will revenge my injuries”<sup>282</sup>. The purpose is quite understandable and that makes it hard for the reader to decide whether to blame him (or them, should I say) or not. Orlick and the creature do undergo the same rough path and their similarities in behaviours only prove that their reactions are human, normal and completely forgivable for they come with good intentions. On another note, when presenting Orlick, we have also said that he was often assimilated with an animal<sup>283</sup>. The creature follows a similar pattern as it answered only with groans<sup>284</sup>. To be completely taken as a monster you cannot deliver a proper speech or else there would be a confusion on the part of your interlocutor. How can this be an animal when it can speak so well? That would not be right. Therefore, both our authors have given as a main characteristic to their protagonists to growl or groan instead of speaking. This also serves to the impression of their being scary. Indeed, when communication is impossible you can only hope that people are going to comprehend each other somehow so as to not end up hurt.

“Many time I considered Satan as the fitter emblem of my condition”<sup>285</sup> : the creature is thus identifying itself with the devil only to be supported by its original. However, the sentence suggests that the “many time” does not mean all the time and that therefore, it does not think of itself as being so anymore. Orlick has never associated himself with the devil even though he has been called so a lot. But even these daemons can surprise everyone. For instance, “I required kindness and sympathy, but I did not believe myself utterly unworthy of it”<sup>286</sup>.

---

<sup>275</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>276</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>277</sup>Ibid., p82.

<sup>278</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>279</sup>Ibid., p90.

<sup>280</sup>Ibid., p113.

<sup>281</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>282</sup>Ibid., p119.

<sup>283</sup>Ibid., p169.

<sup>284</sup>Ibid., p97.

<sup>285</sup>Ibid., p105.

<sup>286</sup>Ibid., p107.

This is the purpose we were referring to earlier in our research work. Indeed, we said that the only thing our villains would fight for was consideration from others and especially their originals. Consideration requires kindness and sympathy but as long as they don't have it they will keep on struggling since they believe that everybody deserves it. Because they did not get it, they “declared everlasting war against the species, and, more than all, against him who had formed me”<sup>287</sup>. Is that yet another reference to Darwin's evolutionary theory? I believe it is. Coincidentally, what we said about Dickens being inspired by our scientist can again be taken a bit further when the inspiration actually comes both from the scientist and from Shelley's work. The universal struggle we were told about in *Great Expectations* was originally the struggle of this one creature to survive in a world where people didn't recognise it as a person. Even we don't because we have always used “it” and not “he” in our analyse. The outcome of this is “I hid myself”<sup>288</sup> : the only recourse of this creature was to hide. How sad is that? Orlick however has proven stronger and more determined because he found “new masters” and did try to go higher and higher in society. Even though our aim is to show how similar the two villains are, we are not to forget that similar does not mean identical. There had to be differences or else there would not have been a purpose in Dickens's creating such a protagonist, one of his own. The creature tells us that while secluded in a forlorn area, it did some “reflection on [its] situation”<sup>289</sup>. By extension, this thinking has led to the wisdom that has come to light during its confrontation of Frankenstein. The same can be said about Orlick. Even though we cannot say for sure that he did reflect on it, we can imagine he did, for he has drawn some fine conclusions on his relationship with Pip and the affects it would have on both their personalities.

“I will work at your destruction”<sup>290</sup> we read, and as everything is a circle - in Darwins' theory it is the observer becoming the observed, in Dickens it is the structure of the book and therefore Pip's life – the poetic justice that would lead us to a full circle would probably be in Shelley's work the fact that the creature killed its creator. The term “work” implies a long process of reflection and imagination which involved time and patience, and in the end we imagine that the good thing to do for the creature would be to get revenge from the one who gave life to him; and what better way to make him feel the sadness than to torture him with the idea that these might be his last moments? That is what happens to Orlick for he must have thought for a long time about the way to get Pip to come. The letter, the trap, the monologue : all this has been thought about

---

<sup>287</sup>Ibid., p111.

<sup>288</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>289</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>290</sup>Ibid., p119.

in details. As a result, “you are the cause of its excess”<sup>291</sup> is one important part of our villains' confrontation with their originals for they know who to blame for this misery of theirs.

If we go back to the originals' feelings now, let us mention Frankenstein when he tells us that “one feeling haunted [him]”<sup>292</sup>. As far as he is concerned, he feels exactly the same way as Pip did for they both are the victims of a persecution that seems endless and most of all the victims of a nagging feeling that someone is following them. And the torment happens even on a physical level because the “ghastly grin [that] wrinkled his lips”<sup>293</sup> shows how terrifying the creature could be when it smiles; we can go as far as to confront that to the episode when Orlick has one eye shut as if he were taking aim at something with a gun. Their faces are dreadful and one cannot just look them in the eyes without feeling a bit shaky. But let us return to the harassment as the creature says “I will watch with the wiliness of a snake. Man, you shall repent of the injuries you inflict”<sup>294</sup> : this promise of being there to watch as panic, remorse and possibly guilt will invade its original's personality reminds us of all the times Orlick was hidden behind a tree in the dark, hoping to get a reaction from Pip. They both hope that their other-selves will pay for what happened to them and though not in a physical way, then in a psychological way. In this respect, it is also amazing how the shadow aspect of Orlick can be found in Shelley's work with the sentence : “apparently close to my ear, addressed me in an audible whisper”<sup>295</sup>. Always there when you don't expect him to be, the double is scary because of his attitude and of his determination to follow you no matter what. However, “whom I pursued”<sup>296</sup> proves that a reversal of the roles has happened at one point in *Frankenstein* for the pursued becomes the pursuer. It happens the same way in *Great Expectations* when Orlick, porter at Miss Havisham's, leads Pip towards his new destiny. We would expect the hero to show his way to the villain but in that episode, it is the other way around. The similarity between the two pairs has been thought of in a very detailed manner. But in the end, the originals only choose to see that [“their souls are as hellish as their forms”<sup>297</sup>]. Blinded by disgust, Pip and Frankenstein follow the same path in their representation of their doubles. By calling them “scoffing devil”<sup>298</sup> or daemons, they associate them with something completely different from what they really are because the originals didn't take the time to understand the reasons why their

---

<sup>291</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>292</sup>Ibid., p127.

<sup>293</sup>Ibid., p138.

<sup>294</sup>Ibid., p140.

<sup>295</sup>Ibid., p172.

<sup>296</sup>Ibid., p174.

<sup>297</sup>Ibid., p178.

<sup>298</sup>Ibid., p174.

doubles act this way. Monsters, and particularly Orlick and the creature, are always at some point driven by “an insatiable thirst for vengeance<sup>299</sup>, an insatiable passion<sup>300</sup>”. You can relate that feeling to the figure of the double quite easily as their main type of relation with their originals is one of rivalry. But our point here is most of all to highlight how the suffering has been turned into anger in the case of our protagonists. There is a symmetry and a proportional amount of resentment as it was first an accumulation of shame, sadness and loneliness. With time, and with experience, our two monsters have been able to understand that they could not remain in that weak state all the time and that is when they decide to claim vengeance and only stop until the death of the one responsible for it all. As Orlick “felt as if [he] were destined for some great enterprise<sup>301</sup>” we discover unsurprisingly that the creature was indeed driven by the same impulse. The fact that the two were always rejected and diminished, pushed them forward with the only idea in mind that they should prove everyone that they are more than just monsters. This is the one part of their argumentation that helps the reader change his mind about the two characters and to side with them instead of defending their originals. “Evil therewith became my good”<sup>302</sup> and have we not said before that Orlick's acts were evil but his intentions were good? The creature seems to be in the same state of involuntary confusion as our doubles try to restore the balance of fairness by using revenge. This is the key point of our argumentation as two monsters succeed in getting our sympathy by simply admitting that at the time it didn't seem like a bad thing to do : the fact that they are clearly mistaken and the helplessness and loneliness that is conveyed by this monologue win us over. “Where can I find rest but in death?”<sup>303</sup> Let us remind ourselves that as far as a pair of doubles is concerned, the death of one leads to the death of the two. To be relieved physically of one's double is to rid the world of the two halves of this whole. And compared to our pair in *Great Expectations*, these two will have, in Shelley's novel, an end worthy of their complicated relationship.

Obviously Dickens has borrowed a lot of ideas from Mary Shelley. If I were to pick just one part which does not concern our pair but the novel in general, I would choose this bit : “As night approached, I found myself at the entrance of the cemetery where William, Elizabeth, and my father reposed”<sup>304</sup>. This is clearly the first scene in *Great Expectations* when Pip is watching the graves of his late family. But as far as couples Pip/Orlick vs Frankenstein/the

---

<sup>299</sup>Ibid., p188.

<sup>300</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>301</sup>Ibid., p179.

<sup>302</sup>Ibid., p188.

<sup>303</sup>Ibid., p190.

<sup>304</sup>Ibid., p171.

creature are concerned, “Mine has been a tale of horrors”<sup>305</sup> is what sums up best our villains' feelings as they look over at their lives. For that, they swear “revenge on [the] cursed head”<sup>306</sup> of their originals. Do not doubt that they hover near the spot [you] inhabit <sup>307</sup> because they do as a double always does. There will be no rest for the other-self “until he or [you] shall perish in mortal conflict”<sup>308</sup> and that bit they both understood very well. Therefore we have been able to see how many similarities existed between *Frankenstein* and Dickens's novel, proving thus how Mary Shelley must have inspired our author in his writing of the relationship between Pip and Orlick. Turning it into a sub-plot did not make it easy for us, readers, to really grasp all of the meanings that were suggested in the different episodes presenting them both, but if we take a closer look everything is there, more or less obviously, to prove how very similar those two couples are. If we are to focus on Orlick only now, he has shown so far how his fight has been the same as the creature's and therefore how symbolic his purpose really was. This has contributed to our saying, with even more conviction, that his role was deeply significant in the novel and how this secondary character could have been elevated to a better status were it not for his original's stubbornness. In this next sub-part we will give him a final extremely important role and make references to someone else he can be compared to, a god who was very important to the Greek mythology, namely Hephaestus.

## ***2. Orlick seen as a mythic figure, the importance of Hephaestus in Great Expectations.***

As “the double originates in myth”<sup>309</sup> this last part of our work is essentially going to show how Dickens had in fact imagined Orlick as having the same characteristics as the Greek god Hephaestus. Surprisingly enough, we understand that he decided to use godly attributes in regards to a secondary character and we will be able to see through this part how the references are at first hints but then become too big to remain unnoticed. Our analyse is going to be challenging for it will consist in following the myth that is Hephaestus's adventures with as many relevant details as possible while always keeping Orlick in mind and link his story to our mythic figure.

---

<sup>305</sup>Ibid., p167.

<sup>306</sup>Ibid., p168.

<sup>307</sup>Ibid., p169.

<sup>308</sup>Ibid., p171.

<sup>309</sup>ZIVKOVIC, Milica «*The Double As The Unseen Of Culture: Toward A Definition Of Doppelganger*», The scientific journal FACTA UNIVERSITATIS, 2000.

It has been said that “the very life force which animates a person in ancient myths returns in the form of an evil, haunting presence eager to do harm”<sup>310</sup>. Orlick, as he is presented in the novel, is not just some annoying character following the hero around with no purpose in life. We have said before that his role was clearly more symbolic but here we get a notion of how symbolic really. He would then be a life force, a sign of strength, something that keeps pushing the beings forward and then becomes something completely different, a malevolent person who probably uses harmful methods. Our villain in Dickens's novel symbolises this contradiction. At one point he will be this poor man who hasn't been treated right and who will fight to regain a bit of pride but at other times he becomes this shadow who is always following Pip as if to suggest that he had hostile intentions. His characteristics are therefore to be found already in ancient myths.

Hephaestus was lame, which gave him a grotesque appearance in the eyes of the Greek people. And it is rather amazing to think that Orlick is very similar for he is always slouching, growling, with one of his eyes shut and with his scary face. Everyone feels about him exactly the same way as the Greek felt about Hephaestus. It is then no surprise and clearly no mistake to induce that Dickens was inspired by the god to create his protagonist. Hephaestus's symbols are a smith's hammer, an anvil and a pair of tongs and let us not forget that Orlick, working at the forge is often led to use a hammer and an anvil. The tongs were probably too obvious and would not have fitted the scenery in the marshes and that is probably why Dickens decided not to go all the way in the similarities between the villain and the god. However, as far as the symbolic weapons are concerned, there is no doubt that they both use the same ones. Athena refused a union with Hephaestus because of his unsightly appearance and crippled nature, and that is when he became angry and forceful with her. She then began an affair with Ares. With this situation, we can go as far as suggesting that in *Great Expectations* our Athena would be Bidley. Indeed, the young girl admits that she is scared by the appearance of the villain and that she would not start anything with him. However, when Pip tries to steal her away from Orlick, we see that she would probably be inclined to go further with him than she would do with the blacksmith. Of course that made him furious but he never forced her into anything and decides instead to remain in his solitude.

Hephaestus was an in-between as this god found himself constantly swung between the earth and the sky. Orlick in the same fashion is not an animal from the marshes nor a gentleman not even a regular man. You cannot categorise him as his behaviour is always changing : one episode you'll find him full of good intentions and the next moment you'll hear he killed the hero's sister. He does not fit in, does not belong anywhere and this feeling of

---

<sup>310</sup>Ibidem.

discrepancy is probably the reason why he is so unpredictably violent. Hephaestus was the only god said to have returned to Olympus after his exile just as Orlick is the only character apart from Pip to have his roots set in the marshes but who was all the same able to go to London and return to the marshes any time he wanted to. If one wonders why everything seems to fit easily, it is because it was assuredly meant to. Indeed, if at first it all seems coincidental, let us take another look at the number of those so-called happy accidents. After we see how numerous they were, one cannot do more than to accept that it was in fact Dickens's doing as he purposely put the references there. Hephaestus has no mother because she rejected him for being too ugly. Do we hear anything about Orlick's background? No parents or acquaintances whatsoever are mentioned and that is probably because it makes it easier then to link our character with the Greek god. After a series of betrayals Hephaestus decided to build a golden chair with invisible fetters. When Hera sat down on this chair she was held fast. This episode reminds us of chapter LIII as Orlick set a trap for Pip. Once he has got his hand on him, he ties him up to a chair from which the hero cannot escape. It is not the exact same development of course, but the basics are here and that helps us in our assertion that Orlick might be the Hephaestus of *Great Expectations*. "Unbind me. let me go!"<sup>311</sup> is what Pip said at that time but can we not transfer this sentence and put it on the lips of the goddess? I believe it can be easily done for the situations are very similar.

It has been said that one should start working at the light of a candle, probably to propitiate a beneficial use of fire by the god. The candle is another hint one cannot miss for it is the instrument of torture which Orlick uses to terrify Pip during their confrontation : "then he took up the candle, and shading it with his murderous hand so as to throw its light on me, stood before me, looking at me and enjoying the sight."<sup>312</sup> Constantly putting the flame closer to the hero's face, the villain is delighted by the moment. So again, a tiny detail in the god's life has been used by Dickens to give more substance to Orlick's character. Hephaestus's power is related to that of the fire of the house hearth (cf :«le fer comme tel (aussi bien le feu du sacrifice que celui de la forge ou le feu qui cuit) est rapporté à Héphaïstos [...] qui incarne cette puissance du feu»<sup>313</sup>). Coincidentally, Orlick is a blacksmith. He works surrounded by fires, and even when he is not at the forge he still gives us indications that the flames feel like home to him. That the two should have the same specialities is yet another clue that Dickens chose his character carefully and knew from the start what he wanted to make of him. As one of the god's legs broke and never developed, we need to mention one more time the fact that Orlick is constantly limping. We never hear the reasons for this slight handicap but the result remains the same :

<sup>311</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p315.

<sup>312</sup>Ibid., p318.

<sup>313</sup>VERNANT, Jean-Pierre, *Mythe et Pensée chez les Grecs*, La Découverte, Poche, 1996, p160.

they both suffer from a broken leg as the villain “came slouching after [Pip] at a little distance”<sup>314</sup>. Orlick, “in addition to the old bruised left side of his face, he seemed to be bruised and torn all over”<sup>315</sup> and the god gives the same impression. Pip describes the villain as having a distorted face and an eye that he keeps shut all the time. In this sentence, “his head was all on one side, and one of his eyes was half-shut as if he were taking aim at something with an invisible gun”<sup>316</sup>, here the image of his aiming at something with a gun is quite funny but also quite vivid as well. It contributes to the contradictory personality of the character because we don't know whether to laugh at or be scared by his appearance. In addition to this physical irregularity, Orlick “showed no hair”<sup>317</sup>. How can you not be scared by someone like that, especially when you're a little boy? But again, we are not sure that this description is completely reliable as Pirrip tends to exaggerate the reality of things.

“As he looked at the fire, [Pip] thought [he] saw a cunning expression, followed by a half laugh, come into his face”<sup>318</sup>. Orlick does feel intrigued and entranced by the fire. This feeling of comfort around it proves that there is something about him that says more about his deeper persona. There is something more for he is one of these men who bring their lot of stories and one particularly that says “that it was necessary to make up the fire once in every seven years”<sup>319</sup>. Why does he have this unusual obsession with fire? Also as Pip tells us that “he always beat his sparks in [the boy's] direction”<sup>320</sup> we can draw the conclusion that he knows enough of what he is doing to control the material he is working with. Who else apart the god of fire can master the flames? The fact that Dickens through Pirrip's narrative takes also the time to let us picture Orlick “leaning on his hammer”<sup>321</sup> is quite interesting. Indeed, if it wasn't for our mind to register that he had all the godly attributes of Hephaestus, why else would he mention this particular position? “Orlick plunged at the furnace, drew out a red hot bar made at me with it as if he were going to run it through my body, whisked it round my head, laid it on the anvil, hammered it out – as if it were I [...] and the sparks were my spirting blood – and finally said, when he had hammered himself hot and the iron cold, and he again leaned on his hammer.”<sup>322</sup> Once again we are given a long description of how well the villain masters his art. There is a routine, a fluidity about it all that makes us think of it

---

<sup>314</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p104.

<sup>315</sup>Ibid., p33.

<sup>316</sup>Ibid., p62.

<sup>317</sup>Ibid., p63.

<sup>318</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>319</sup>Ibid., p91.

<sup>320</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>321</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>322</sup>Ibidem.



as a choreography that ends up with a final pause on the hammer. More than that we could say «les secrets de métier, les tours de main du spécialiste rentrent dans le même type d'activités et mettent en jeu la même forme d'intelligence, la même métis que l'art du devin, les ruses du sorcier, la science des philtres et des enchantements de la magicienne.»<sup>323</sup> In any case, whether it be dancing or doing magic, the art of a blacksmith requires dexterity. “Orlick was very soon amongst the coaldust and in no hurry to come out of it”<sup>324</sup> : this sentence is the clear proof that the universe of the forge – with the fire, the coaldust and such – is where he belongs. To be in no hurry to come out of somewhere means that you feel at home, that it is comfortable. Who else would like it in such a place? It had to be something else, something more meaningful about Orlick than just a regular journeyman.

And if we go back to the weapons both the villain and the god have in common, let us be reminded that Pip's “sister had traced upon the slate a character that looked like a curious T [...] the sign looked like a hammer [...] Orlick without a doubt”<sup>325</sup>. It is not just us : the hero of the story also thinks of the blacksmith when he sees a hammer. It could have been Joe, or somebody who would have stolen the hammer, but to Pip it is assuredly Orlick. Even his expressions are quite unusual. “Burn me if I know”<sup>326</sup> is not that common and the blacksmith doesn't seem surprised to use it. Why burn? It's like the time when he used “hunt me out of the country” instead of “drive me out of the country” : at that point, Orlick wanted to be assimilated with an animal. What about now? It seems as if Dickens knew perfectly what he was doing and was enjoying it as sadistically as the villain does when he tortures Pip. We are the author's victims because we will never know for sure if he intended to imply all those things or if we are on the wrong track. And it gets even more frustrating when Orlick replies “burn me twice over”<sup>327</sup>. How are we supposed to let those hints go by without making anything out of it. There had to be a purpose and I think that it is because this secondary character is much more symbolic than what meets the eye. After all, so far he has been pretty surprising because he has corresponded to the criteria of so many archetypes, why not a god? In chapter LIII, when Pirrip tells us about his condition and how “a flare of light flashed up, and showed [him] Orlick”<sup>328</sup>, the theatricality of the scene is marvellous and the fact that everything comes up to this little light is just brilliant. And as the blacksmith “lighted the candle from the flaring match with great deliberation”<sup>329</sup>, we are undoubtedly led to the conclusion that this relation between the man and

<sup>323</sup>VERNANT, Jean-Pierre, *Mythe et Pensée chez les Grecs*, La Découverte, Poche, 1996, p302.

<sup>324</sup>DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, 1999, p92.

<sup>325</sup>Ibid., p99.

<sup>326</sup>Ibid., p180.

<sup>327</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>328</sup>Ibid., p315.

<sup>329</sup>Ibidem.

fire is quite significant. To be so close to a flame all the time and to be shown as liking the idea of a flame nearby, there is only Hephaestus who would be seen acting this way.

« Mais cette affirmation de la présence en nous d'un élément non corporel apparenté au divin et qui est « nous-même », comme cette approche naturaliste du corps marquent dans la culture grecque plus qu'un tournant : une sorte de rupture.<sup>330</sup> » If we were to assimilate the image of a god with that of a fictitious villain, we would then be creating a sort of fragmentation between this idea and all other ideas. However, is this not what we have been doing all along with the figure of the double? Indeed, a double is in himself the symbol of a rupture and while this particular one was dividing himself from the hero of the novel, he might be also the standing (or rather slouching) example of this unprecedented view on godlike elements formative of one's personality. « Dans une culture comme celle de la Grèce archaïque où chacun existe en fonction d'autrui, sous le regard et par les yeux d'autrui. »<sup>331</sup> We can see how this particular culture has lingered on and on and has even given our current culture the basis that makes everything as it is. The wisdom of this sentence is that you cannot have a clear conception of who you are if you do not take the time to see yourself in the eyes of others. This is exactly what our pair Pip/Orlick is all about. Indeed, as we have said before, Orlick needs Pip's approval to become wholesome. If we can set the villain in this far-away context, therefore we are entitled to establish a link between a god of that time and the protagonist. « Héphaïstos a fabriqué un miroir pour Dionysos et c'est après y avoir jeté les yeux et y avoir contemplé son image qu'il a été porté à la création de tout ce qui est particulier. »<sup>332</sup> In some way we can link this sentence to the novel. Indeed, as we have shown that Orlick was in fact a mirror image of Pip, when Dickens imagined the confrontation he knew that his villain was already special. He does not follow the myth in details but he does takes some bits and pieces and rearranges them as he sees fit. The main conclusion is that he got his inspiration from mythology.

« C'est ce bonheur qu'Héphaïstos propose aux deux amants couchés corps contre corps : « je peux vous fondre ensemble [...] de telle sorte que, deux comme vous êtes, vous deveniez un »<sup>333</sup>. This episode is the perfect example of what we just said. To be happy – and for Orlick it means to feel as a complete person – the villain needs the approval of his other-self. The said acceptance would mean to allow those two protagonists to become one. Dickens has used this part of the myth to develop his double motive because he shows us how the hero's decision of being assimilated with the blacksmith would have as an

---

<sup>330</sup> VERNANT, Jean-Pierre, *L'individu, La mort, L'amour*, Folio Histoire, Gallimard, 1989, p9.

<sup>331</sup> Ibid., p53.

<sup>332</sup> Ibid., p158.

<sup>333</sup> Ibid., p163.

outcome two people merging, if not literally then metaphorically. “Prometheus and Hephaestus are called to the rescue. They come running with a battle-axe; they hit Zeus a great blow to the skull (Athena was born).”<sup>334</sup> What will be our focus here is the blow to the head. It is not a mild fact that both the god and Orlick have a history of hitting someone violently on the head. For Hephaestus it is Zeus, and for the villain it is Mrs Joe. We could go even deeper and say that because of this blow, while Athena was born, Pip was given a shot at independence, but let us not go too far. For the moment, the thing we are sure of is that Dickens drew an obvious parallel between the two with this particular action. “Zeus calls together Hephaestus, Athena, Aphrodite and some minor deities [...] so Hephaestus sets about moulding a figure, a statue.”<sup>335</sup> In the hierarchy of gods, Hephaestus is an important one. Why then did Dickens decide to attribute all these criteria to a secondary character? I think on the contrary that it is the brilliance of the novel. Since Orlick was not given his shot in the fiction, the readers and critics are the ones allowed to let him shine. The importance he can take when we focus on his character from a literary point of view is actually what he wanted to happen within the story.

«Pandora signifie « celle qui donne tout » [...] « celle qui fait sortir les présents des profondeurs » [...] elle apparaît comme un produit de l'art : elle est l'œuvre d'un démiurge qui la fabrique avec de la terre, et qui est tantôt Héphaïstos, tantôt Prométhée.»<sup>336</sup> An interesting argument comes out of this sentence. Indeed, if we consider that Hephaestus was the one who created Pandora, and if Orlick is indeed the representation of the figure of the repressed as we said him to be, then both entities act in the same fashion for they find something buried deep inside and make it come out to the surface. Clearly there is a bond between the god and the villain that has yet to be explored. To reinforce that idea, we may mention that «Pandora aussi est double sous bien des rapports. Elle est un mal, mais un mal aimable.»<sup>337</sup> Once again, what we can say about this creation is also true for Orlick. We have proven before that he acts following his impulse and this is a bad sign most of the time. But because his intentions have been shown to be pure and significant, we have mentioned that it meant contradictorily enough acting evil for good reasons. Animer une statue de pierre ou de terre, lui donner la vie après l'avoir façonnée<sup>338</sup> is in some way what the villain desperately tries to do with his original during the scene of confrontation. Indeed, on hearing Orlick's monologue about them meaning more to each-other than what he thinks, Pip keeps a stony face. The blacksmith would

<sup>334</sup>VERNANT, Jean-Pierre, *The Universe, The Gods and Mortals*, Profile Books, 2001. Translated by Linda Asher, p28.

<sup>335</sup>Ibid., p56.

<sup>336</sup>VERNANT, Jean-Pierre, *Mythe et Pensée chez les Grecs*, La Découverte, Poche, 1996, p266.

<sup>337</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>338</sup>Ibid., p334.

do anything to change the boy's expression after having delivered the few lines that changed his life. But he only encounters frustration as he sees that his words have had no effect on the hero. "Hardly had I finished the manuscript when it struck me what it means to live with a myth, and what it means to live without one, says a Church Father, is "what is believed always, everywhere, by everybody."<sup>339</sup> However, we can say with certainty, and especially in literature, that if a theory is not accepted by everyone then it does not necessarily make it untrue. What I mean is, and I'll take this example because this proves my confidence in this work, if ever my theory (that of Orlick being in fact Dickens's will for us to draw a parallel with Hephaestus) turned out to be completely false and stupid in the eyes of a majority of people, it would not stop some people to think the same way as I and make it all therefore a valid hypothesis.

"If we can succeed in discriminating between objective knowledge and emotional value judgements, then a gulf that separates our age from antiquity, is bridged over, and we realize with astonishment that Oedipus is still alive for us."<sup>340</sup> Everything is possible, and the possibility for a secondary character to be associated with a god from the Greek antiquity is not to be put aside just because there is a gap between the two periods. "In the end, such complexes [...] assume, by self-amplification, an archaic and mythological character"<sup>341</sup> : in our case then, Pip suffers from the complex (desperately trying to pass for the victim) and Pirrip by exaggerating everything projects all the faults onto this godlike image that is Orlick. He is archaic, quite brutal and wild, but this sentence seems to draw the same conclusions as ours. However, what we expected from the pair was not to throw the blame at each-other. Usually people "personalize and rationalize themselves to the point where a dialected discussion becomes possible"<sup>342</sup> and unfortunately we haven't reached that point with them. La croyance à l'âme, issue de la division du moi en une partie mortelle et une partie immortelle; ces deux parties sont d'abord pareilles ou tout au moins peu différentes (corps et ombre) dont l'une disparaît tandis que l'autre continue son existence.<sup>343</sup> This was how their story was supposed to end : as Pip realised and accepted that he was partly made of himself and of Orlick (and vice versa) it should have set the boundaries between the two so they could go their separate way knowing exactly who they are, what they're worth and how they're going to evolve. The loose end, however, did not give them the opportunity to set things straight. Nevertheless, des nombreuses explications aussi variées que complexes, des superstitions concernant l'ombre, nous voulons encore retenir

<sup>339</sup>JUNG, Carl Gustav, *The Basic Writings*, Modern Library, 1993, p5.

<sup>340</sup>Ibid., p9.

<sup>341</sup>Ibid., p72.

<sup>342</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>343</sup>RANK, Otto, *Don Juan et le double*, Petite Librairie Payot, 1932, p66.

celles qui en font un ange gardien<sup>344</sup> in which case, of the persecutor that the villain proved to be, we should only keep in mind the tender-minded Orlick who insists on walking Pip and Bidy home so as to make sure nothing happens to them. Le persécuteur est représenté souvent par le père ou son remplaçant, mais nous trouvons surtout ce double identifié avec le frère<sup>345</sup>, which is the last archetype we could find Orlick to be associated with. More than a god now he could also be the image of Pip's brother. So many father figures have been found in *Great Expectations* that it would not have shown how special the blacksmith was. Therefore we will decide to keep with the brotherly figure because that singles him out once more. L.B. Schneider said « le frère cadet ressemble même dans la vie courante à son frère aîné. Il est en quelque sorte devenu l'image vivante du Moi fraternel et en conséquence un rival en tout ce que son frère voit, sent et pense »<sup>346</sup> which sums up quite beautifully all the changes Orlick has gone through to be noticeable in the eyes of his original.

As “one might say of Hephaestus that he is an artisan, a blacksmith”<sup>347</sup> just as Orlick, it has become clear over time that Dickens's intentions were multiple. After having gone through the many faces the villain could be associated with, the last one we displayed was definitely not the least. Indeed, on seeing the many attributes of the god Hephaestus, as well as the several episodes in which he appears in Greek mythology, one could not dismiss all the common points this figure had with our journeyman. From his tools to his expressions and even in his demeanour, Orlick is the perfect representation of a god camouflaged in a fiction. Our strongest argument in this last part of our work remains that this extensive and thorough work has been in the end what Orlick expected Pip (and everybody else) to see. He was special, no doubt about that, but we needed to point it out more accurately as a casual reader would not notice it at first. And as everything is a question of circles, we might even put Frankenstein's creature in this parallel with Hephaestus. Indeed, as our scientist explains that he was “seating [him]self by the fire which [his] odious companion had lighted”<sup>348</sup>, we find again this strange attraction to the fire on the part of Orlick, the creature and of course the god of fire. We completed the circle in joining our mythical figures to our central one, hoping that all the explanations were clear and logical.

---

<sup>344</sup>Ibid., p72.

<sup>345</sup>Ibid., p87.

<sup>346</sup>Ibidem.

<sup>347</sup>VERNANT, Jean-Pierre, *The Universe, The Gods and Mortals*, Profile Books, 2001. Translated by Linda Asher, p136.

<sup>348</sup>SHELLEY, Mary, *Frankenstein*, Oxford World's Classics, 2008, p79.

## Conclusion

Having reached the end of this thorough work of research, one can assert that our purpose has been achieved. Indeed, the reasons for this *mémoire* were twofold as on the one hand we wanted to point out the important bond that existed between Pip and Orlick, and on the other hand we wanted to highlight the fact that the blacksmith was special. To underline the specific relationship of the two characters, we focused on the image of the double and what it represents. Surprisingly enough, Orlick answered all the criteria and could therefore be categorised as being the hero's other-self. The rivalry and the many oppositions on everything, - especially the binary opposition between good and evil – and the mirror image that proved how the two have had in fact a similar evolution, were all in all the final conclusion that they were doubles.

To give more depth to this work we then tried to focus on the scientific point of view concerning such a relationship between two people. The term “evolution” gave away already that we would mention Darwin, and more specifically what Pip would have become if he hadn't been called by Mr Jaggers to hear about his benefactor. In this respect, Orlick was the closest image to this parallel evolution had things been different. But more than that, when we mentioned Freud, we could see how the villain could be assimilated to the figure of the repressed, the uncanny, and especially the return to the surface of what had been buried inside in early childhood. His constant pursuit of the hero has been proven to be a metaphorical way to express this childhood trauma that Pip wanted so desperately to forget. However, Orlick would not see it that way and chose to make it obvious to Pip that you cannot flee forever. As Jung was Freud's student and since they both grew apart because they had different views on the subject of the unconscious, it was interesting to focus on how the villain corresponded also to the figure of the shadow. A literal shadow of course at the beginning, but as we carried on with our research we discovered that he was also the clear symbol of this bag-stuffing associated with such a figure.

We then took the time to understand the reasons that pushed Pip to refuse Orlick as his double and the ones that made the villain insist on the fact that he was right. For Pip, we got to the conclusion that it was simply a matter of status and that he did not want to be seen as an equivalent of this wild monster. However, we noted several expressions that suggested that Pip was by himself making the association between him and the other. As far as Orlick was concerned, we discovered with great surprise that he was not the protagonist we expected. Indeed, his motives being so grand, we were amazed to witness the change in his behaviour as he became clear-sighted and more and more upset by the sterile situation. His main purpose was to be given a shot at greater

expectations and the fact that he was not given any by the end of the novel proved to be quite frustrating for him. However, we noted how their relationship came to a loose end which made it impossible for anyone to draw conclusions that were certain. We tried to figure out why Dickens had chosen to end it like this but those were mere musings and we will never know the actual reasons.

Finally, in our last part, we decided to concentrate on the mythical aspect of *Great Expectations*, and especially that of Orlick, using as a basis two crucial figures : Frankenstein and Hephaestus. It turns out that the pair Frankenstein/his creature and Pip/Orlick presented many similarities that led us to admit that Dickens was very much stimulated by Shelley's pair. His presents differences of course, or else there would have been no point in plainly copying the original couple, but all in all the stronger emotions and events have been conserved for us to give it meaningful interpretations. In regards to the Greek god, we were given food for thoughts as the many common points made it hard for us not to believe that Dickens gave Orlick all this attributes on purpose.

Therefore we are led to conclude that the motif of the double seems to resist narrow categorization<sup>349</sup> as Orlick could not be the representation of just one archetype but several actually. This secondary character thrilled us by his ability to be contradictory, yet quite moving. His affect on us was so deep that it even led to the destruction of the sole purpose of the book : to sympathise with Pirrip. If we focus hard enough on this man, which we did, we realised that the descriptions and narrative orchestrated by Pirrip were just unreliable as they didn't focus on the true reality of things. In that respect, we will never sympathise with the narrator because we have taken the time to understand what Orlick is all about : an enormous and seductive object<sup>350</sup>. For all the roles that have been attributed to him, “as an imagined figure, a soul, a shadow, a ghost or a mirror reflection that exists in a dependent relation to the original, the double pursues the subject as his second self and makes him feel as himself and the other at the same time”<sup>351</sup>, we are given the opportunity to comprehend that this constant pursuit was in fact a wake-up call for the hero to realise it was not too late to change his mind about their meaning to each-other. Even though we can admit that the double has wrong sides for “the many partial, dual and disintegrated selves scattered through literature violate the most cherished of all human unities : the unity of “character””<sup>352</sup> we must adhere to the idea that had

<sup>349</sup>ZIVKOVIC, Milica «*The Double As The Unseen Of Culture: Toward A Definition Of Doppelganger*», The scientific journal FACTA UNIVERSITATIS, 2000.

<sup>350</sup>ZIVKOVIC, Milica «*The Double As The Unseen Of Culture: Toward A Definition Of Doppelganger*», The scientific journal FACTA UNIVERSITATIS, 2000.

<sup>351</sup>ZIVKOVIC, Milica «*The Double As The Unseen Of Culture: Toward A Definition Of Doppelganger*», The scientific journal FACTA UNIVERSITATIS, 2000.

<sup>352</sup>ZIVKOVIC, Milica «*The Double As The Unseen Of Culture: Toward A Definition Of Doppelganger*», The scientific journal FACTA UNIVERSITATIS, 2000.

Pip accepted to recognise Orlick as such they would have achieved, hardly but surely, this unity of character because they would have felt whole for once in their lives.

So that was the main purpose of this mémoire which has been a very long work but quite enjoyable, especially as its end “coincides with the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the first chapter of *Great Expectations*”<sup>353</sup>. And if we were to remember just one last thing about Orlick and the figure of the double, that would be this sentence :

« Où tu vas, j'y serai toujours,  
jusqu'au dernier de tes jours,  
où j'irai m'asseoir sur ta pierre »  
(Alfred de Musset, *Nuit de Décembre*).<sup>354</sup>

---

<sup>353</sup>MEDWAY MATTERS, Dec. 2010 Jan. 2011, Page 20.

<sup>354</sup>RANK, Otto, *Don Juan et le double*, Petite Librairie Payot, 1932, p13.



## **BIBLIOGRAPHY :**

ANZIEU, Didier, *Psychanalyse et culture grecque*, Les Belles Lettres, édition originale utilisée, 1980.

APPLEMAN, Philip, *Darwin*, Norton, c2001, original edition 1979.

BLY, Robert, *A Little Book On The Human Shadow*, HarperOne, original edition 1988.

CALLAHAN, Jean, *The (Unread) Reading version of Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, original edition 1999.

DICKENS, Charles, *Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, original edition 1999.

FREUD, Sigmund, *La naissance de la psychanalyse*, Presses universitaires de France, édition originale utilisée, 1969.

GILMOUR, Robin, *The pursuit of gentility*, Norton Critical Edition, original edition 1999.

HOLLINGTON, Michael, *David Copperfield by Charles Dickens*, Didier érudition CNED, édition originale utilisée, 1996.

HOUSE, Humphry, *G.B.S. on Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, original edition 1999.

JOURDE, Pierre, *Visages du double, un thème littéraire*, Nathan Université, édition originale utilisée, 1996.

JUNG, Carl Gustav, *The Basic Writings*, Modern Library, 1993, original edition 1959.

McEWAN, Ian, *Enduring love*, Vintage Books, London 2006, original edition 1998.

MOYNAHAN, Julian, *The Hero's Guilt: The Case of Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, original edition 1999.

RANK, Otto, *Don Juan et le double*, Petite Librairie Payot, édition originale utilisée 1932.

REUCHLIN, Maurice, *Histoire de la psychologie*, Presses universitaires de France, 1996, édition originale 1957.

SHELLEY, Mary, *Frankenstein*, Oxford World's Classics, 2008, original edition 1989.

TROTTER, David, *Introduction to Great Expectations*, Penguin Classics, 1998, original edition 1969.

VAN GHENT, Dorothy, *On Great Expectations*, Norton Critical Edition, original edition 1999.

VERNANT, Jean-Pierre, *The Universe, The Gods and Mortals*, Profile Books, original edition 2001. Translated by Linda Asher.

VERNANT, Jean-Pierre, *Mythe et Pensée chez les Grecs*, La Découverte, Poche, 1996, édition originale 1965.

VERNANT, Jean-Pierre, *L'individu, La mort, L'amour*, Folio Histoire, Gallimard, 1989, édition originale 1960.

## ARTICLES:

GRAY, Richard, « *Freud and the Literary Imagination* », Autumn Quarter, 2010. Lecture Notes : Freud, « *The Uncanny* », 1919.

FREUD, Sigmund, *L'inquiétante étrangeté (Das Unheimliche)*, 1919. Traduit de l'Allemand par Marie Bonaparte et Mme E. Marty, *Essais de psychanalyse appliquée*, 1933.

LACAN, Jacques « *Le stade du miroir comme formateur de la fonction du Je* » Communication faite au XVI<sup>e</sup> Congrès internationale de psychanalyse à Zurich, le 17 juillet 1949.

MEDWAY MATTERS, Dec. 2010 Jan. 2011, Page 20.

ROGERS, Robert, *A Psychoanalytic Study of The Double in Literature*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit, 1970.

VIVES, Jean- Michel « *Le théâtre psychopathologique et la scène psychanalytique* » paru dans l'avant scène théâtre Janvier 2008.

ZIVKOVIC, Milica « *The Double As The Unseen Of Culture: Toward A Definition Of Doppelganger* », The scientific journal FACTA UNIVERSITATIS, 2000.

## WEBSITES:

*Héphaïstos/Vulcain* (<http://mythologica.fr/grec/hephaistos.htm>)

WEISS Zoe *Seeing Double, Double Seeing: The Use of Doubles in Great Expectations* ([www.victorianweb.org](http://www.victorianweb.org))